

MAY 24 1932

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

The Classical Review

EDITORS [E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
[Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 58, St. Albans Road, Edinburgh.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management :

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, LL.D., F.B.A.
Prof. A. G. CLARK, LL.D., F.B.A.
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.
(Hon. Treasurer).

With the Chairman,
representing the Council
of the Classical
Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing
the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. D. B. ROBERTSON, M.A., representing the
Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University.

Vol. XLVI

MAY, 1932

No. 2

CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	49	REVIEWS (continued):	
THE RESTORED PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.		<i>A Short History of the Roman Empire to the</i>	
L. R. FARNELL	51	<i>Death of Marcus Aurelius</i> (Wells and	
KTIAOZ. D'ARCY W. THOMPSON	53	Barrow). G. H. STEVENSON	74
AESCHYLUS, PERSAE 732. A. Y. CAMPBELL	54	<i>Coins of the Roman Empire in the British</i>	
ANIMAMQUE SUPERBAM. W. F. J. KNIGHT	55	<i>Museum</i> , II (Mattingly). D. ATKINSON	75
THE TEXT OF THE LOEB VITRUVIUS: A REPLY.		<i>A Lexicon to Josephus</i> (Thackeray). R.	
F. GRANGER	58	McKENZIE	76
REVIEWS:		<i>Der historische Wert der Caracallavita</i>	
<i>Vom Tauschhandel zum Welthandel</i> (Schaal).		(Reusch). M. FLATNAUER	77
J. L. MYRES	61	<i>Thought and Letters in Western Europe, 500</i>	
<i>Ancient Corinth</i> , I (O'Neill). C. R. WASON	62	<i>to 900 A.D.</i> (Laistner). F. J. E. RABY..	78
<i>Corinth</i> , VIII, 1: <i>Greek Inscriptions</i> (Meritt).		<i>A Book of Medieval Latin for Schools</i> (Wad-	
M. N. TOD	63	dell). S. GASELEE	79
<i>Corinth</i> , IX: <i>Sculpture</i> (Johnson). A. WACH	64	<i>Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax</i> (Havers).	
<i>Les Procès d'Impiété intentés aux Philosophes</i>		W. E. P. PANTIN	80
<i>à Athènes</i> (Derenne): <i>Polycrates, l'Accusa-</i>		<i>Linguistique balkanique</i> (Sandfeld). R. M.	
<i>tion de Socrate, et la Gorgias</i> (Humbert).		DAWKINS	81
A. W. GOMME	65	<i>Some class-books</i> . D. H. GRAY	83
<i>Plato and his Contemporaries</i> (Field). K. W.			
LUCKHURST	68	SHORT REVIEWS	84
<i>Rome and the Romans</i> (Showerman). W. E.			
HEITLAND	69	CORRESPONDENCE	92
<i>Makers of Europe</i> (Conway). K. R. POTTER	70		
<i>Cicero's ad Atticum Epistularum libri V-VIII</i>		SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	93
(Sjögren). W. T. VESEY	71		
<i>Half-Lines and Repetitions in Virgil</i> (Sparrow).		BOOKS RECEIVED	94
F. H. SANDBACH	73		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. F. C. G. Langford, 35, Alleyn Park, Dulwich, S.E. 21. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Miss E. C. Gedge and Mr. R. M. Rattenbury) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

— JUST ISSUED —

THE TEXT VOLUME OF THE MINIATURES OF THE MANUSCRIPTS OF TERENCE

PRIOR TO THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

By L. W. JONES and C. R. MOREY

THIS volume is the commentary on the complete corpus of the Terence miniatures, comprising almost 800 reproductions which appeared last year. The text volume affords a complete description of each manuscript and an analysis of its illustration, providing also such determination as is possible of the date and provenance of each codex, and the particular variety of mediæval style which is represented by its illustrations. The concluding chapter summarizes the findings of the authors, and includes a presentation of the descent of the illustrative tradition in Terence manuscripts, as well as a discussion of the relative value of the manuscripts as representatives of the archetype which was written and illustrated in the fifth century A.D.

The two volumes together are priced at £9 17s. 6d. net. They are sold separately at the price of £4 net for the text volume and £6 12s. 6d. net for the volume of plates.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Amen House London, E.C. 4

Murray's

Classical Atlas For Schools

Edited by G. B. Grundy, M.A., D.Litt.

Consisting of 83 Maps and Plans. Folio (14½ × 9½ ins.). The maps in this atlas have been most carefully prepared so as to accentuate all the chief names and natural features of the countries. In the new edition all the maps have been thoroughly revised and some new contours have been added.

SECOND EDITION. 9s. net.

A CONCISE DICTIONARY OF GREEK & ROMAN ANTIQUITIES

Based on Sir Wm. Smith's larger Dictionary, and incorporating the results of modern research. Edited by F. Warre Cornish, M.A. 25s. net

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., W. 1

and
upon
ional
e) to
reate

nual
f 5s.
lings
sical
sical
the
y be

Mr.
nt to
Hon.
or to
yth,
eds,
orth
ern,

S

itt.
olio
ave
en-
ares
the
me

Fr
'T
Assoc
the
Reac
men
time
Reac
ality
mus
to m
look
shin
Roo
frier
urba
som
Asso
Leo
vers
the
ever
now
feat
the
'
the
stan
dom
cola
able
a w
Roo
livi
add
som
tion
in
lect
the
illu
by,
abl
fes
isti
us
Bo
ful
cee

The Classical Review

MAY, 1932

NOTES AND NEWS

FROM a correspondent :

'The General Meeting of the Classical Association was held from the 11th to the 14th of April at the University of Reading; considerably over a hundred members attended. It was the first time that the Association had met at Reading, and the charm and individuality of the youngest English University must have come as a delightful surprise to many. Its gardens and green lawns looked their best in the cool April sunshine, and from its hospitable Common Rooms one carried away a sense of friendly leisure, at once rural and urbane, which may well be the envy of some of its sister institutions. The Association was welcomed by Mr. Leonard Sutton, Chairman of the University Council, and subsequently by the Mayor of Reading. On the last evening the annual dinner, which has now become an established and popular feature of these reunions, was held in the Senior Common Room.

'On the academic no less than on the social side the meeting was an outstanding success. Sir George Macdonald's presidential address on "Agricola in Britain" was not only an admirable specimen of the lecturer's art, but a weighty contribution to the history of Roman Britain by one of our greatest living archaeologists. A presidential address illustrated by lantern slides is something of a novelty to the Association, but Sir George handled his theme in no narrowly antiquarian spirit; his lecture furnished a perfect example of the manner in which material records illuminate, and are in turn illuminated by, the written word. Another memorable address was that in which Professor Gilbert Murray with characteristic sympathy and insight laid bare for us the mind of the young Aristophanes. Both these lectures will be printed in full in the forthcoming volume of *Proceedings*.

'All the remaining papers were contained in NO. CCCXXXVII. VOL. XLVI.

tributed by past or present members of the staff of Reading University, or of the Reading and District Branch of the Association. Their number and quality afforded good evidence that classical studies have taken firm root in Berkshire. It is not possible here to do much more than give a list of them; but special mention must be made of Professor P. N. Ure's ingenious "Babylonios Logos," which illustrated in the Greek field, as the president's address did in the Latin, the help that archaeology can give to her elder sisters, history and philology. Dr. W. H. Semple brought to life an undeservedly forgotten Latin romance, John Barclay's "Argenis"; Miss J. Toynbee convinced us that Roman sarcophagi can be charming; Dr. J. A. Nairn dealt with "Cicero and his Greek Originals," and Professor E. R. Dodds with the personality of Plutarch; while Professor D. Atkinson lectured on the Silchester Collection in the Reading Museum, and later lent his expert guidance to a pilgrimage which visited the site. The archaeological collections in the University Museum, both Greek and Roman, were also open to inspection and aroused considerable interest. The practical side of classical studies was, as usual, not forgotten; an afternoon was devoted to a discussion on "Combined Courses in Classics and English," introduced by Miss D. E. Limebeer, the Headmistress of Broughton High School. That this full and varied programme of activities was carried through not only without a hitch, but without a single awkward moment, is sufficient testimony to the care and foresight with which it was organised. To the local committee responsible, and especially to the able and energetic local secretary, Miss N. C. Jolliffe, the Association owes a real debt of gratitude.

'At the business meeting the Association received with great regret the resignation of Mr. H. F. Hose from the

office of Honorary Treasurer, in which he has served it so well. Dr. W. D. Ross was elected President for the ensuing year, and Mr. Langford Honorary Treasurer. It was decided to hold the next full General Meeting at University College, Nottingham, upon the invitation of the Council of the College.'

The second issue of the Proceedings and Selected Papers of the Classical Association of South Africa, covering the period 1929-1931, is eloquent of the vigorous growth of a body founded only in 1927. It opens, as is pious and fitting, with a portrait and an obituary notice of Professor William Ritchie of Cape Town, whose death in September last left a blank on the title-page of the *Classical Review*, and it contains the address on 'Latin Letter-writing and Apollinaris Sidonius' which he was to have delivered as President of the Association, and which 'was found in his study, ready for the printer without the alteration of a word.' Virgil naturally bulks largely in this issue; the Bimillenary Address was undertaken by the President, Professor A. Petrie of Maritzburg, who contributes a judicious and conservative appreciation of the poet's work; and there is a well-merited recommendation of Professor T. J. Haarhoff's *Virgil in the Experience of South Africa*, which was to have been included in this issue,

ἀλλ' ἀναμασθὲν ἀναπέφνη βιβλίον.

Two further papers, on 'Menander and the New Comedy' by Professor C. S. Edgar, and on 'Primitieve Kultuur en die Godsdienst van Griekenland' by Dr. W. Rollo, illustrate the catholicity of classical scholarship in South Africa, and the linguistic problem which faces it.

From Mr. R. Gardner:

'In the Proceedings of the British Academy, Volume XVII., there is a memoir of Thomas Ashby by A. H. S. Well-informed, comprehensive and sympathetic, it will be received with appreciation and gratitude. Those who

need can learn from it the extent and the quality of the contribution made by Ashby to our knowledge of Italian antiquities from his enrolment as the first student of the British School at Rome in 1901 through the labours of his Directorship down to his tragic death. In the words of his epitaph he was "a great scholar." It may be permitted also to one who was first a pupil and later a friend of Ashby to say how faithfully this memoir portrays the little tricks of manner which revealed his candour, loyalty, generosity and sterling worth. Memories of him are not easily lost: the short stocky figure, liberally begirt with multifarious equipment, the reticence which would surprisingly transform itself into boyish, almost explosive exuberance, the amazing energy and powers of concentration. Those who walked and worked with him are grateful for the example of his active life, and mourn the loss of the years of co-operation and friendship which they hoped were still to come.'

We welcome the first number of a new archaeological annual, *Hesperia*, a large quarto published by the Harvard University Press for the American School at Athens at the very moderate price of three dollars. Most of the first number is devoted, appropriately enough, to Athens, and it opens sensationally with a large fragment from the west pediment of the Parthenon, discovered no further afield than the doorstep of the Acropolis Museum. Other articles deal elaborately with the Pnyx and with a shrine of Eros and Aphrodite on the slope of the Acropolis. Print, illustrations and general get-up are excellent, though so substantial a volume requires something stouter than a wrapper to keep it intact.

Teubner's latest catalogue, *Verzeichnis von Ausgaben griechischer und lateinischer Schriftsteller*, showing recent reductions of price and other changes, may be had free of charge on application to B. G. Teubner, Leipzig C 1, Poststr. 3.

THE RESTORED PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.

THE movement towards reform that was beginning in one or two of our Public Schools as early as 1873, and has long won the support of most of the progressive teachers of the classics in the universities, colleges, and schools, has recently been challenged and derided by the pronouncement of the Headmaster of Eton and by sundry letters on the subject published in *The Times*. Many of these letters reveal strange ignorance and confusion of thought. The matter is of considerable importance; and as a daily paper is not the natural place for such a discussion, I am anxious to appeal through the pages of the *Classical Review* to the better judgment and stronger will-power of our classical students and teachers of both sexes. For I was in at the beginning of this movement, having been in the Sixth Form of the City of London School when the headmaster, Edwin Abbott, whom I have always regarded as the greatest teacher of his time, made this reform in 1873; and I do not want to be in at its death. When I went up to Oxford in 1874, I had to become bilingual, as the English-Latin pronunciation was long predominant. But the movement towards the truer Latin speech was making headway, and received a strong impetus when in 1905 the two Philological Societies of Oxford and Cambridge met in the Hall of Exeter College, at the invitation of the Oxford members, to consult and if possible to come to an agreement on this question. The arguments in favour of abandoning our English-Latin pronunciation appeared overwhelming to the large majority of us. And we were all agreed that we would not change over to Italian-Latin, or to French-Latin, or to German-Latin, but would endeavour to restore the original sounds of the speech spoken by Cicero and Virgil, so far as these could be determined with certainty or probability. A joint committee of philological experts was thereupon appointed, who finally issued an agreed schedule of sounds, which was broadcast round the

universities and schools and won wide acceptance; and it probably still holds the field in spite of obstruction and reaction. A few elderly bureaucrats, vice-chancellors, and public orators could not be induced to abandon a tradition that goes back to at least the time of Elizabeth, who rebuked the men of Cambridge for degrading Latin by pronouncing it as if it were English. And in a few schools the passive resistance of the boys or under-masters may have thwarted the initiative of a weak-willed headmaster. Still, before the war there was every hope that reasonableness would prevail, and that throughout educated Britain we might hear real Latin truly pronounced. But now, as in so many other ways we are suffering from an intellectual shrinkage due to post-war depression, so in this matter also the old barbarism is reasserting itself. There appears to be a danger that it may recapture Eton, and that other schools may follow her bad example. It is necessary then to make a new effort to convert the reactionaries.

We may first ask why the two classical languages should be taught differently from every other language, living or dead, that has ever been or is being taught. Obviously the beginner who is learning French, Italian, German, or any other living language is trained to master the living pronunciation, whether this is difficult or not. It is no less true that when the specialist is teaching Old Icelandic or Old Persian or Vedic Sanskrit or any other dead speech he endeavours to discover—and usually succeeds in discovering—how that language was pronounced at the time of its 'floruit,' and he teaches the pupil the sounds that once issued from the lips of the living men who used it aforetime. Surely the *onus probandi* lies on those who demand that we should teach Latin as if it were modern English, presenting the deluded pupil with a language that cannot be called 'dead,' but one that never lived. It is mere indolence to argue that the old method saves trouble and is easier for

boys and girls. We do not argue so when we teach French, in which there are many new sounds difficult for an Englishman to master. In the true pronunciation of Latin, that which we have restored, there is not a single sound that offers any difficulty to English vocal organs. How easy it is to acquire—given average skill in the teacher and average exertion in the pupil—I can attest from my own experience in 1873: being habituated to the Latin of John Bull, we began by scorning the new sounds, but in three weeks we had easily acquired them and come to love them.

There is another trite defence for English-Latin, the language that never lived. It is urged that as the other nations have done the same thing, the Italians pronouncing Latin as if it was Italian, the French as if it was French, the Germans as if it was German, so we are justified in pronouncing it as if it was modern English. The answer is that because other nations have gone astray is no reason why we should not come back to the truth and thus give the lead to the others in an important reform. It must also be recognised that none of these other peoples have so disguised and degraded the original Latin as we have done; for they have all the good fortune to have preserved at least the old Latin vowel-system unchanged; whereas our speech has strangely changed the sound of the first three vowels and mainly of the fifth: therefore our English-Latin is immeasurably the farthest from the original speech, and would sound unintelligibly barbarous in the ears of Cicero and Virgil if it could reach them.

It is then our educational duty to carry this reform through. And it is quite easy to impress the new sounds upon virgin ears, and not difficult even if we have to deal with ears preoccupied by the bad tradition. Apart from our duty and our conscience, two great advantages will accrue.

True Latin is far more sonorous and beautiful than Anglo-Latin. This is impossible to prove here. Its musical superiority is measurable by that of the Italian vowel-system—practically the same as old Latin—over the English;

to take a special example, by the inestimable gain rendered back to our ears by the true pronunciation of the first vowel. We are familiar with the old argument that has been heard again in some of the recent letters. 'Tennyson found Latin beautiful and pronounced it in the English fashion: what was good enough for Tennyson is good enough for me.' Tennyson had no chance of hearing true Latin; had he heard it, being of most musical ear, he would certainly have preferred it. The splendour of Virgil survives our mispronunciation. That is no reason why we should continue to pervert the sounds that came from his lips, and to deprive our pupils of the aesthetic delight of hearing true Latin well read and well intoned.

The second great advantage is that we could, if we took the trouble, establish the restored Latin speech as a *lingua franca* throughout the educated western world. One of the deepest calamities attending the downfall of the Roman Empire was the confusion of tongues, whereby the peoples that had formed that greatest of societies yet evolved by man became mutually unintelligible. Still, for some centuries a certain fellowship was preserved for the nations by the use of the old Latin as the literary speech of the cultivated few in each land. But we have indolently allowed the last remaining link of linguistic unity to be lost by our failure to preserve the purity of the original speech.

We must first re-establish unity at home. The speediest and most effective course might be for the two oldest universities to send round once more a joint appeal to the schools, and to inform them that their students who came up to Oxford or Cambridge would be required to learn the reformed pronunciation, if they did not bring it up with them.

We should then send out an invitation for an international Philological Congress, reviving the fashion of happier days of scholars of different nations meeting in conclave for the interchange and discussion of views. Before such a congress we could plead for the adoption of our plan for the revival of true Latin

speech. No one who knows the philological evidence will controvert the main points, and the change will be all the easier for the other nations, as their pronunciation has kept nearer to the original sounds than ours.

We should also enhance the value of our reform if we insisted more on oral and conversational practice as part of the Latin training in our schools.

L. R. FARNELL.

ΚΤΙΛΟΣ.

Κτίλος in the *Iliad* means 'a ram,' and modern commentators have little or no more to say of it. Damm's *Lexicon Homericum*, a useful old book, defines κτίλος as 'aries, dux gregis . . . qui praeit gregem'; repeating Hesychius, κτίλος ὁ προηγούμενος τῆς ποίμνης κριός. So Ebeling's *Lexicon Homericum*: 'aries, dux gregis.' There is more to the same effect in Bochart's chapter *De grege pastorum*; and above all there is a delightful account of the *dux gregis*, or *dux ovium*, in Yates' *Textrinum Antiquorum* (1843), a learned and beautiful book which seems unknown to the younger generation of scholars. Yates quotes, from the Hon. Keppel Craven's *Excursion in the Abruzzi* (1838), an account of a South Italian shepherd: 'Armed with his crook he walks some paces in advance of his flock, followed by an old ram called *il manso*: which word, meaning tame or instructed, has undoubtedly a more apposite signification than that of our bell-wether, though he is, as well as ours, furnished with a large deep-toned bell.' *Il manso* is the exact counterpart of κτίλος.

Odysseus stood by Agamemnon (Γ 196) as the wise old ram, *dux ovium*, beside the shepherd, αὐτὸς δὲ κτίλος ὡς ἐπιπωλείται στίχας ἀνδρῶν and again (N 491) the Trojans were as sheep following their appointed leader, λαοὶ ἔπονθ' ὡς εἴτε μετὰ κτίλον ἔσπετο μῆλα. 'Before his fleecy care, erect and bold, Stalks the proud ram, the father of the fold,' is Pope's translation. There is a similar picture in Propertius (3. 13):

Corniger Idaei vacuum pastoris in aulam
Dux aries saturas ipse reduxit oves:

The fold receives the sheep on Ida fed,
By the great ram, their horny chieftain, led.

The word κτίλος does not occur in the *Odyssey*, but the great ram who carried Odysseus out of the cave, the pride of the flock, ἀρνεῖός γάρ ἐην, μῆλων ὅχ' ἄριστος ἀπάντων, was the same tame and pampered animal; the Cyclops talks to him as would any other shepherd, calls him κριὲ πέπον, his pet and his darling, and wonders why he is so late of leaving the cavern, he who was used to lead the flock, and be first in the meadow and first at the pool.

Aristotle (*H.A.* vi. 573b 25) speaks of the old sheep, ἡγεμὼν τῶν προβάτων: how he is brought up to his duty from his earliest years; how he knows his name, and steps out in front when told to do so; and how he lives to a great age, even to fifteen years old. Servius tells us that τίτυρος was another name, a Laconian name, for the same animal: 'T. dicitur aries maior, qui gregem anteire consueverit.'

In Greece and indeed all the Mediterranean countries the *dux gregis* still leads the flock; only in Spain *el manso*, the leader of the great flocks of merino sheep, is not a ram but a he-goat. A certain Greek lady was good enough to send me a photograph of the tame ram, a large and beautiful animal, standing by the side not of a shepherd but of a shepherdess; and to write to me, saying: 'Yes, in Greece the sheep are led by a tame ram, which in the Modern Greek language is called τὸ λαγιαρνί. As a rule it is the best sheep, with long fleecy wool, and wears a bell round its neck, and it is by the sound of the bell that the flock is led.'

I wrote also to several friends in Italy, hoping to hear of some variants of the name *il manso*, or some alternative names in local dialects. Only one such name was given me, but it is a good one. Professor Di Mauro Salva-

¹ So Quint. Smyrn. i. 174: πολλοὶ ἔποντ' . . . ἰαδόν, ἥντε μῆλα μετὰ κτίλον, ὅς θ' ἅμα πάντων νισσομένων προβήσι δαημοσύνησι νομήος.

tore of Catania wrote: 'Parmi nos bergers siciliens le vieux bélier qui marche en avant du troupeau, à côté du berger, s'appelle *C'rastu*: en italien, *montone*; ou bien, *C'rastu campanari*, et en italien, *castrone guidajuolo*.' *C'rastu*: it can surely be no other than Greek *κεράστης*, the *corniger* of Propertius! But now we may recollect that in Euripides' Sicilian play of the *Cyclops* the shepherds sing: ὕπαρ' ὦ ὕπαρ' ὦ

κεράστα, ἠηλοβότα στασιωρόν 'Come up, come up, old Horny!' In all Greek literature there is no other such use of the word *κεράστης*. It is highly interesting, it is very beautiful, to find Euripides putting into the mouths of his Sicilian chorus a shepherds' word, which shepherds on the slopes of Etna have in use to-day.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

University of St. Andrews.

AESCHYLUS, PERSAE 732.

Ατ. Βακτρίων δ' ἔρρει πανώλης δῆμος, †οὐδέ τις
γέρων.† 732
Δα. ὦ μέλεος, οἶαν ἀρ' ἦβρον ἐνυμμάχων ἀπώλεσεν.

μέλεος, sc. Xerxes, not B. δῆμος. 'The whole citizen army of the Bactrians has perished, not merely some old man.' Such is the nonsense which results from supplying ἔρρει. For things like Paley's 'and that no mere reserve force of old men,' Teuffel-Wecklein's 'und gar keine greisenhafte Mannschaft'—these are not to be got out of *this* Greek; the camel corps is ἡ κάμηλος: κάμηλός τις could only mean some one camel.

I cannot myself see that any other supplement is possible; but some, although they do not say so, do in effect supply ἔστι. Let us assume that we, by putting a colon after δῆμος, can legitimise this. Weir Smyth, following Blomfield and Prickard, renders 'not even an old man is left.' Now, to supply ἔστι is one thing, to supply ἔστι (or rather περίεστι) quite another; but even if we could do so, who supposes that the Bactrian army, for some unexplained reason, was composed partially of old men? Not Darius anyway, as is evident from his reply. Sidgwick's astonishing note resolves itself on examination into a supplement of ἔστι as if in the sense of ἐνῆν. Hermann's 'Bactriorum . . . periit exercitus, neque ille imbellis' is all very well; but render fairly 'neque ille senex' and the oddity becomes apparent; it must take more than γέρων λέμβος, *Damascenum senex*, to justify the strange expression γέρων δῆμος (an old people!) for the unnatural idea 'a people consisting mainly of old men'; nor can I find an instance of the

'restrictive' (L. and S.) use of τις in a negative sentence.¹

Of emendations, Dindorf's δῆμος οὐ δῆ τις [τοι Hartung] γέρων are commendable as successive syntactical rectifications of Hermann's sense, but no further; Heimsöeth's εἰ μή τις γέρων spoils πανώλης with its prosaic particularity, and is in any case too coarse a change; Halm's οὐδ' ἔσται γέρων is impossibly elliptical, and not to be saved by Mazon's helpless dash.

About one thing, surely, we may be quite certain, and that is that there was nothing here about old men.

And yet again, Weil's οὐδέ τις (sc. ἔστι) περῶν gives (among other² objections) a sense that is surely somewhat bald; nor can I imagine anybody taking kindly to Jurenka's οὐδέ τις (ἔστι) σπερῶν 'und niemand (ist) da, es fortzupflanzen.'

These are all at least decent efforts. In a class by itself stands ἡδ' Αἰγυπτίων, which Wilamowitz positively placed in his text.³ The crude violence of this interpolation would tend to distract

¹ The case is of course quite different where the negative goes directly with the adjective (and is accordingly placed next it), ἐγὼ δέ τις οἱ ταχυπειθής Theocr. VII. 38, οὐ πολλοὶ τινες (i.e., ὀλίγοι τινές) our play, 510. As for οὐ πάντις, that is, like οὔτις, another affair.

² That Ionism, the 'schema Chalcidiacum,' is Tragic, and Aeschylean, but (naturally) not with the part of εἶναι unexpressed; indeed, such a thing as Plat. *Rep.* 374 D8—E2 is different in any case. And who would write οὐδέ τις περῶν when he could have written οὐδέ τις περῶ?

³ Nor does the mystery cease there; read W's crit. n., then consult the 1893 Addenda to Wecklein's Appendix.

attention from the absurdity of suggesting that for an Athenian audience the Egyptian people was *in pari materia* with the Bactrian as regards the possibility of annihilation.

Far sturdier sense, and finer poetry, can be secured when Palaeography also shall receive her due. I read¹ οὐδ' ἐπισχερό. The Bactrians have been wiped out at a blow; they have perished, not all merely, but all at once; that is 'and not piecemeal either.' Aeschylus took this word, as he took so much else, from Homer; and he took it from

a particular passage. In *Iliad* XI. 668 Nestor asks Patroclus whether Achilles is waiting until the sons of the Achaeans be slain one after another, *in a series* as he bitterly puts it, αὐτοὶ τε κτενόμεθ' ἐπισχερό. The episode is a salient in the plot of the poem, and in the passage referred to this is the uncommon and the poignant word, therefore memorable. The passage itself is in the key of ours, a recital of disasters. The epic adverb is of a form rare enough to be corruptible; it is found seven times, once in an epigram of our poet's elder contemporary Simonides.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

University of Liverpool.

¹ First proposed by me at a meeting of the Oxford Philological Society, February 27, 1931.

ANIMAMQUE SVPERBAM.¹

uis et Tarquinius reges animamque superbam
ultoris Bruti fascesque uidere receptos?

(Verg. *Aen.* VI. 817, 818.)

COMMENTATORS have generally seen that the natural syntax connects *animamque superbam* with Brutus, but that the natural sense connects it with the Tarquinii. Servius set the example of assuming that what he would like to be possible here is possible. He only remarks: 'unus enim de Tarquiniis fuit superbus.' Donatus mentions the difficulty, but gives no solution: 'superbiae uitium Tarquinio applicatur secundum ueterum fabulas, non Bruto.' It is important to notice that it occurs to neither of them that *superbus* might have a good meaning. Like Servius, Heyne² seems to have thought that *superbia* could only have been imputed to the last Tarquin: '*ultor Brutus*, qui Tarquinii superbiam et Sexti libidinem ultus est.' Conington³ realised that Vergil had transferred the epithet of Tarquinius to Brutus, but only at the cost of a serious misunderstanding of the meaning of *superbus*: 'Vergil has

not chosen to call Tarquin "superbus," but has transferred the epithet to Brutus, the majestic and inflexible founder of Roman liberty, doubtless intentionally, so that there is no ground to suspect the text with Peerlkamp and Ribbeck.' Of course, as Servius and Donatus knew, *superbus* here cannot mean anything like 'majestic and inflexible.' Dr. E. Norden⁴ gives a fuller discussion. He notices that the uncertainty must have existed in antiquity, quoting Servius and Donatus, and adding that the copyist of M shows, by his punctuations after *reges* and *Bruti*, that he followed the interpretation of Donatus: so in general have commentators since the Renaissance, some of them arguing that the transference of the epithet of Tarquinius to Brutus is a point of interest. Norden maintains that this interpretation must clearly be wrong, and that Vergil—to paraphrase his language in prose—can only mean: 'Brutus Tarquinii superbiam ultus est, fascibus recuperatis populoque restitutus.' This implies that the *-que* after *fasces* must be taken as if it had occurred after *ultoris*: Norden cites Leo⁵ for the rendering, and for the use

¹ The suggestion which I make in this note occurred to me during a discussion with Mr. W. H. G. Fletcher. The nature and extent of the debt cannot now be determined; but I gratefully acknowledge the help of his conversation.

² *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera* (Leipzig, 1828), Vol. II., p. 101.

³ *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (London, 1872), Vol. II., p. 528.

⁴ *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis, Buch VI.*³ (Leipzig and Berlin, 1926), p. 328.

⁵ In *Nachr. d. Gött. Ges.* (1895), 429. 3. Neither in his commentary nor in his Appendix III. (pp. 391-404) does Norden cite any sufficient parallel for the transposition of *-que*

of this line as evidence for the transposition of *-que* to dependence on the third word of a group. Accordingly, Norden himself in his text¹ punctuates with a comma after *superbam*, and no other stop till the end of line 818, and translates:² 'Willst du auch sehen des Tarquinerkönigs Hoffärt'ge Seele, seh'n die Rutenbündel, Die Brutus ihm, der Rächer, wieder nimmt?' In this way Norden at least avoids the mistranslation of *superbus*: though he does not appear to explain that the mistranslation is the main objection which he avoids. But the expedient involves harshness and violence: and in spite of its advantage it is rarely adopted. Professor H. E. Butler³ returns to the explanation of Conington. He states the argument against the Servian assumption, and continues: 'There is not the slightest objection to taking *animam superbam* in its natural connexion with *ultoris Bruti*, who is proud as being the founder of the liberties of Rome.' But, once again, *superbus* does not mean 'proud.' Dr. G. Funaioli⁴ criticises Norden: and though he does not escape the chief difficulty of the current interpretation, with which he identifies his own, his contribution is valuable, because he takes the sympathetic approach to Vergil which is usual for Italian scholars. Funaioli remarks that only the Tarquins are called *reges* in this passage, and that they have no other description. He explains that Vergil hastens on from them to exalt in Brutus the qualities by which he recovered liberty for Rome: the name of *rex* was still held in horror, and there was no need for Vergil to add the obvious epithet *superbus* to the implications of tyranny in *reges*. Therefore, according to Funaioli, he applies it to

which he has to suppose. I believe that most scholars continue to think that it would be unique. Transpositions to the beginning of the second half of a pentameter are clearly irrelevant.

¹ Norden, p. 98.

² *Ibid.*, p. 99.

³ *The Sixth Book of the Aeneid* (Oxford, 1920), p. 251. Professor Butler thinks that the transposition of *-que* would not be quite unparalleled, but he does not cite other instances.

⁴ *L'Oltretomba nell'Eneide di Virgilio* (Palermo and Rome, 1924), pp. 155, 156, and p. 156, note 1.

Brutus, and it effectively prepares the way for his characterisation. Funaioli translates *animam superbam* by 'spirito,' which in Italian probably shares more of the content of *superbia* than the English 'pride,' and so may have concealed the difficulty. Why *superbia* should be appropriate to Brutus is partly suggested by the comments, which follow, on his patriotic cruelty; where the judgment of Plutarch,⁵ that Brutus must have been either more than human or less, is cited. Funaioli's method of close examination and aesthetic criticism is good; but there are still difficulties. *Superbia*, especially in a context where the proximity of the name of particular reflects upon it its intense particular association, is more than any 'sternness' or 'cruelty.' It is the quality for which the name of king was accursed in Rome: and some strong reason must have been needed if it was to be wrested from the Tarquin with whose name and story it was entwined.

The truth of course is that Vergil definitely but unemphatically attributes to Brutus a 'tyrant soul,' not to the Tarquins. The mistakes have arisen from the *a priori* assumption that no one but a Tarquin could in the same context and in the same sense be called *superbus*. But, once the natural and necessary translation has been accepted, we can approach the more profitable attempt to discover why Vergil should accuse Brutus, and not only the Tarquins, of tyrannical ways. The three following lines do not explain that; though they show that Vergil did not admire Brutus blindly.

Professor D. L. Drew⁶ leaves little doubt that there is a sense in which the *Aeneid* is allegorical. Aeneas certainly corresponds partly to Augustus. He is in general what Vergil hoped that Augustus would become,⁷ and the hope was fulfilled as well as might be ex-

⁵ *Publicola* VI.

⁶ *The Allegory of the Aeneid* (Oxford, 1927), *passim*.

⁷ Professor R. S. Conway [*Martin Classical Lectures*, I. (1930: Harvard University Press, 1931), pp. 178-179] contends that Vergil and Horace influenced Augustus towards clemency.

pected. But in this sphere the man of action, like the rest of nature, *non uincitur nisi parendo*, even by a great poet. The ideal must be made acceptable to him: it must meet the actual nearly if not quite half-way. This task for Vergil was delicate, and meant that Brutus, for example, must be praised ambiguously at the most, for fear of the perpetual comparison with the Brutus who led the conspirators against Julius. To praise Brutus was to disparage Julius. But the best method of all was a surreptitious *tu quoque*. Brutus must be the real enemy of liberty, if possible: though the judgment must not be emphasised so strongly that it could seem ridiculous to all who believed the opposite.

To make this clear another well-known difficulty must be considered. In 46 B.C. Julius¹ and in 41 B.C. at Perugia Octavianus² perpetrated human sacrifices. The efforts to relegate these incidents to oblivion have succeeded in raising doubts whether Octavianus was actually guilty of human sacrifice at all: but in spite of them the evidence remains sufficient. The reaction on Vergil is interesting. It was his undoubted task to furnish heroic and legendary precedent for such an atrocity, provided that the provocation had been great enough. This he did with characteristic delicacy: for Aeneas designs to sacrifice eight prisoners of war to the spirit of Pallas.³ The episode has always been thought to need explanation: and the whole question of human sacrifice in relation to Vergil has lately been discussed by Professor Catherine Saunders,⁴ who collects the evidence, but does not make a definitive decision. It seems to me that the outworn practices of a barbarous age are irrelevant, except in so far as epic must conform to Homeric precedent; which could also help by making the deed of Aeneas seem literary and conventional, an additional advance.

tage. But at any rate, since Octavianus had sacrificed human beings, Aeneas must certainly, on some appropriate occasion, be ready to do so too.

It is with the same subtlety and lack of emphasis—so often a reason why he has been misunderstood—that Vergil transfers the blame of tyranny from the tyrant to the tyrant's enemy. We have still one step to take. There remains the question why it should have been worth while to hint that the enemies of monarchy could be blamed for *superbia* itself rather than for some slighter fault. The reason is important, for it shows how the cases of Brutus and of human sacrifice both fit into Vergil's scheme of political justice. It is provided by an acute observation of Professor W. P. Clark,⁵ that for Vergil, whenever deeds of horror are justified, they are justified by a preceding *superbia*. Thus we are to think, if we think at all, that it is the extreme republicans, the enemies of Aeneas and Augustus, who are *superbi*:⁶ and in these princes, the ideal and the actual, we are to condone severities as deeds not of cruelty but of vindication.

W. F. J. KNIGHT.

Bloxham School.

⁵ In *Classical Journal* XXVII. (1931-1932), pp. 39-41.

⁶ To Vergil, as Professor J. L. Myres kindly reminds me, *superbus* must have closely recalled the Homeric *υπερβιος, υπερφιαλος*, in the sense apparent e.g. in *Iliad* III. 105-110. The quality is directly opposite to the Augustan *επεικεια*. If Vergil wished to 'legitimise the monarchy of Augustus,' as in some sense he certainly did [a view mentioned without explicit endorsement by Funaioli (p. 155), who cites for it (p. 155, note 2) E. Goumy, *Les Latins* (Paris, 1892), p. 203], he must necessarily deprecate the faults both of the old regal monarchy and of republicanism. This twofold deprecation is sufficiently apparent, *pace* Funaioli, in *Aen.* VI. 817, 818.

I think that my insistence on the necessity of a derogatory meaning for *superbus* is sound, above all in this context. The instances, given by Lewis and Short, in which the post-Augustan meanings seem to appear already in Augustan poetry, are mainly metaphorical and quite indecisive. Among them is Verg. *Aen.* I. 21: *hinc populum late regem belloque superbum* . . ., which at first sight suggests a meaning 'proud,' for the nation is the Roman nation. But the thought is Juno's; and here too *rex* and *superbus* are associated. To Juno, Roman rule may well have seemed a tyrannical despotism.

¹ Dio Cass. XLIII. 24. 3-4.

² Suet. *August.* XV.: Dio Cass. XLVIII. 14. 3-4: Seneca, *De clement.* I. xi. 1. Seneca says that Augustus hated the memory of his youthful atrocities, and was a very different man in after years.

³ *Aen.* X. 517-520.

⁴ *Vergil's Primitive Italy* (New York, 1931), pp. 97-120.

THE TEXT OF THE LOEB VITRUVIUS: A REPLY.

THE author of a book has no reason for complaint if his critic approves the execution of the task which he has undertaken. My business was to produce an adequate translation of Vitruvius. And the approval of Professor Robertson in the February *C.R.*, even within the limits he has marked—'laudari a laudato'—contents me. The question of the text is another matter.

It was in my instructions that I should take the last critical text as my starting-point. In this Professor Robertson rightly interprets the general intention of the Loeb Series. But when I examined Mr. Krohn's text in the light of a minute collation of the Harleian MS. 2767, I found that of some hundred and fifty emendations in the first five books I could admit only eight to the text. Throughout (following H, and for the convenience of readers who only know Latin) I have retained H's transliteration of Greek into Latin. This accounts for another fifty changes in Krohn's text. Even in his first twenty pages he further disturbs the text by twelve omissions, six interpolations, and two transpositions. By removing these I simply return to the text of Rose and Müller-Strübing. Vitruvius' technical style, like that of modern specifications, appears to an amateur as alternatively condensed and discursive. Hence Krohn's interpolations and omissions. Krohn's insensitiveness to technical phraseology, for example, leads him to emend 'inambulatio,' I. iii. (a word found in Pliny, *N.H.*, and in almost the same sense in Cicero), to 'ambulatio.' These instances will serve.

Like Krohn, *pref.* XI., I take Rose's first edition 'pro vulgata.' My critical notes are limited by the purpose of the Loeb Series. But owing to the excellence of H they are adequate. My first three pages, for example, are a precise transcript of H. But I silently correct some spellings.

I.

Mr. Krohn is a Ciceronian, and is thereby at a disadvantage in following his craftsman-author's thought. Hence

his transpositions. As Cicero said in the *Offices* (I. 151) architecture, like medicine and teaching, is all very well for persons not apparently of the highest class. The architect, in a word, is placed along with professors, etc. Cato the elder had already confined the term 'classical,' 'classicus,' to persons of the highest class: Gell. VII. xiii. 1. Gellius himself applies this distinction on the advice of Fronto three hundred years later: 'classicus adsiduusque scriptor non proletarius' (*ib.*). From the same passage it appears, however, that an orator can be classical. Hence Mr. Krohn in applying Ciceronian and oratorical canons to Vitruvius is animated by the true classical spirit.

This spirit, so deep-rooted in the Roman social order, is attacked, however, on the side of language also by a common person in Plautus two years before Zama:

Quin tu istanc orationem hinc veterem atque antiquam amoves?

Proletario sermone nunc quidem hospes utere.

Mil. III. 1. 135.

The classicists being thus shouldered from Latin by the proletariat spoke Greek at Rome in the best circles for four hundred years. Latin took refuge in the provinces of the west and in the workshop.

Periphrasies' injunction is repeated by the two best exponents of the style of Vitruvius. Nohl, the compiler of the indispensable *Index Vitruvianus*, declares: 'omnia . . . exponere quibus Vitruvius discedit a communi loquendi usu . . . et longum est nec huius loci,' *Analecta Vitruviana* 5. Stock, who is not less indispensable, warns us: 'inde fluxerunt omnia quae a viris doctis vituperantur' (a phrase surely inapplicable to the courteous comments of Professor Robertson), 'inaequalitas maxime dictionis,' *De Vitruvii Sermone* 6. Here 'syntactical relations . . . correspond immediately to the psychical relations between the ideas denoted by the words,' Paul, *Germanische Philologie* I. 213. I hope, therefore, if, after acknowledging with thanks Robertson's two corrections,

I. i. 16, where I omitted to credit the Florentine edition with 'de visu,' and II. viii., where I adhere to the text and not to the translation, I may be allowed to state the grounds on which I am unable to follow him further. The arguments which follow are drawn from the common stock, though apparently not familiar to English scholars: Strong, *History of Language*, pp. 285-313.

In Vitruvius the plural verb often resumes an implicit number of material things. Hence I. v. 3, 'ea (materia) *et* in terra obruta *et* in aqua conlocata' is a logical plural, and is followed by the plural verb 'permanent.' I therefore reject the 'permanet' of G.

A similar consideration disposes of the grammatical objection to H's 'habebunt' in III. iii. 7. The singular subject is analysed by the dependent genitive into its references, and is led up to a plural verb: 'ipsarum columnarum altitudo modulorum habebunt iustam rationem.' These are only two out of a number of cases of the *Plural of Specification*, which may be regarded as a vernacular idiom; it is not infrequent in English. For its use, the intervention of a word or words between the singular subject and the plural verb is usually required. The periodic structure of the Latin sentence facilitates this. G, in the supposed interest of grammar, interpolates here a passage which is *superfluous*, the modules proper to the eustyle are defined below III. iii. 10; and *inaccurate*, the modules are not eight and a half but nine and a half.

Professor Robertson's learned history had not appeared when my MS. went to the press, or I should have removed G's interpolation, III. v. 2. H reads (I bracket G's interpolation): 'dempta plintho reliquum dividatur in partes quattuor, fiatque superior torus (quartae reliquae tres aequaliter dividantur et una sit inferior torus) altera pars cum suis quadris scotia.' If we translate H, we have: 'taking the plinth away, the remainder is to be divided into four parts, and the top part is to be the torus, the remainder is to be the scotia with its fillets.' This formula for the Attic base, a roundel above and a sweeping scotia beneath, accords

with Cockerell's restoration at Bassae (Robertson, *op. cit.* 139), although the proportion of the roundel is apparently less than one-quarter. On the other hand, the bases in the Nike temple at Athens give a much larger proportion to the roundel, but the scheme is the same. It was repeated in a late temple at Paestum. The origin of G's interpolation is obvious. He misunderstood 'superior,' to which 'pars' should be supplied from the preceding 'partes.' That gave him 'the upper torus,' although there was only one; and he completed the scheme by inventing the 'inferior torus.' He was still left with two quarters, which he understood under 'altera pars,' H understanding by 'altera' three-quarters.

The most striking interpolation of G in I. i. 1, 'cuius iudicio probantur omnia,' is anticipated by S, a MS. of the tenth century, which, judging from Krohn's collation, was almost certainly derived from H, with which its agreement is remarkable. This latter is the view of Giry, who discovered S, *Revue Philolog.* 1879, 18. The interpolation was apparently due to the misunderstanding of 'opera' (which has the sense of personal service) and wrong punctuation. It is difficult to explain this borrowing without the assumption that G is derived from S. In that case G is the grandchild, instead of the child, of H.

II.

The peculiar character of the style of Vitruvius himself may be best explained by comparing it with similar phenomena in the Hellenistic *lingua franca* which begins with Aristotle. Over against the Atticism of Plato and Demosthenes in which persuasion reached its highest achievement and the cloaking of the truth eluded the listener ('concessum est rhetoribus ementiri in historiis,' Cic. *Brut.* 45) was a more uncouth and blunter realism which employed the definite and—to the stylist—repellent terminology of the sciences and the arts, including under these latter the systems of philosophy. The extreme case of this was Chrysippus, who in set words instructed the followers of a better life to neglect the niceties of

language: to pass over hiatus, obscurity, elliptical expression and even solecisms, Plut. *Stoic. Rep.* XXVIII. 2. Where most men would be ashamed to be caught out, Chrysippus flaunted his contempt of the stricter school in 'the careless and impure style' of multitudinous works. Vitruvius, who has many points of contact with Aristotle and the Porch, falls far short of such grammatical imperfection. But the canons of Nohl and Stock, already quoted, exactly express the terms on which the emendation of Vitruvius is to be approached. It is necessary 'to trust in logic' rather than rhetoric. Vitruvius' style is that of an accomplished engineer with a turn for philosophy. Hence it is probable that H is right in reporting Vitruvius to have said: 'ne putet me erravisse si credam rationem,' and that by 'rationem' he meant the Stoic (Aristotelian) logic, which had a good deal more to do with St. Paul's way of thinking and consequently with the foundation of the Christian Church than is usually perceived. Robertson forgot his Plato and λογισμῷ πιστεύειν, *Rep.* X. 603A (not to speak of πιστεύω λόγῳ, Soph. *El.* 886), a context which probably influenced Vitruvius, even if indirectly. But why should obedience to reason be a fault, cf. 'erravisse'? Because λογισμός had often in Hellenistic Greek a bad sense, that of 'cunning,' as is the case almost throughout the LXX. Paul's λογικὴ λατρεία is germane.

In the context of this passage Vitruvius, who uses 'definire' always in the sense of plotting out in space, denotes 'definition' by 'terminatio.' He knows 'species' and, as appears from IV. pref. 1, 'genera.' He also knows the Stoic categories, referring to 'qualitates' as distinct from quantity in the latter passage, quantity being mentioned below. 'Natione' unnecessarily perplexed Robertson, II. pref. 3; it is explained by the phrase 'e quibus rebus esset nata,' II. i. 8, which takes the place of 'genus.' I was justified therefore in appealing to the similar use of 'natio' in Pliny *N.H.* Another philosophical term is 'historia,' which is correlative with 'causa.' Vitruvius introduces his 'histories' to furnish the replies to inquiries. The first example

explains why Caryatids were used as columns, I. i. 5; the second why 'telamones' were used in a similar way, VI. vii. 6. The example of Sir James Frazer's *Golden Bough* shows how such inquiries may have a scientific character. We have to go back to Plautus, *Menaechmi*, II. i. 23, for a similar usage:

in scirpo nodum quaeris. quin nos hinc
domum
redimus nisi si historiam scripturi sumus?

III.

Professor Robertson lacks some of the qualification for speaking as he does of my inadequate archaeological equipment. He starts off by failing to recognise in my frontispiece the close resemblance of the Corinthian order of the Capitol at Dougga to the formulae of Vitruvius. But then I went to Dougga to verify this. He wrote his history without visiting Africa; Carthage, Dougga, Lambaesis, Timgad, Djemila, with their museums and those of Algiers and of the Bardo at Tunis, are as important for the study of Roman architecture as the rest of a bibliography which omits the catalogues of these museums.

I wonder whether Robertson's disagreement with me about 'caementum' and 'testudo' is a question of Latin or English. I notice that he shies at the use of the word 'rubble.' In some parts of England rubble has the meaning of 'concrete': generally it means 'broken stones.' It is in the latter sense that it is used in specifications. Nor is he familiar with the use of the term 'vault' to denote the shape of a ceiling independently of its material. Wooden vaults are not infrequent in churches: there is one under the tower of St. Mary's, Nottingham. The first 'vault' of the Pantheon was almost certainly of wood. Hence its destruction by fire. On this I am shortly publishing an article. Hence 'vault' correctly describes the roof of the Basilica at Fano.

I can now correct my translation of II. viii. 5 to accord with the text. '(Graeci) utuntur e molli caemento polita' I take to refer to 'soft stones coming squared from the quarry': a

sense which agree with modern practice, Seddon, *Builder's Work*, 99 f. Such work covered with stucco I observed when I was in Athens. It was introduced from Rome. The passage in Vitruvius would lead us to antedate the time usually assigned for the innovation.

I. vii. 2 is explained from Verg. *A.* II. 714, 'desertae Cereris' is 'Ceres extra urbem,' and the cult-name 'per sacrificium' is also given by Verg. *A.* IV. 58 as 'legifera,' which does not refer to lawgiving in general but to the laws of marriage in particular. The place of the temple in the suburbs has no special reference to Rome, as suggested by the commentators. It exactly corresponds to Δημήτηρ πρὸ πόλεως θεσμοφόρος at Smyrna, *C.I.G.* 3194. 3211.

Robertson has omitted my two most important suggestions for the emendation of the text. At IV. iii. 7 I suggest 'numina' instead of 'flumina' HG for the subject of the carving of the metopes, and support it by 'numinum simulacra' and 'effigies numinum' from Tacitus. Vitruvius thus lays down the rule that metopes must be left plain, 'pura,' or carved with the images of the gods, 'numina scalpantur.' The metope thus gains almost a religious significance. The window must be clear, or

else divine figures, and they only, must look out of it. This rule is followed very generally in Greek building. It illustrates the interrelation of architecture and sculpture. The temple is the house of the Image. My other emendation, 'scabillus' for 'scamillus,' in the famous phrase 'per scabillos impares,' is rather the restoration of H's reading in V. ix. 4. Perhaps it should have appeared also in III. iv. 5. It will appear in X. x. 3. 'Scabellum,' according to Varro *L.L.* V. 168, meant the step up which one climbed into bed. Cato *R.R.* 10. 4 has the spelling of H 'scabillum'; so also has Quintilian I. iv. 12. The Amiatinus here agrees with H, Ps. 99. 5, one of the many proofs of its common origin.

It is impossible to separate, as Robertson vainly attempts to do, the grammatical from the technical interpretation of the text. And, generally speaking, technical interpretation is only possible to a craftsman who like Lethaby can use his hands. When I found that in the index to his history Professor Robertson ignored the craftsman, I concluded that the peculiar merits of Vitruvius would be somewhat hidden from him by his failure to visualise the process of erecting buildings.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

REVIEWS

ANCIENT TRADE.

Vom Tauschhandel zum Welthandel: Bilder vom Handel und Verkehr der Vorgeschichte und des Altertums. By HANS SCHAAL. Pp. xii+202; sixteen photographic plates, two folding maps, sketch maps in text. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner. 1931. M. 8 (paper); M. 10 (cloth).

THIS book began, as the author frankly explains, in a collection of lectures and separate essays, and certain topics are still handled with an independence and on a scale which detaches them from their context. But in a textbook, still more in a popular summary, this is no great harm; indeed, these 'pictures' of

ancient life would have shown to better advantage if they had not been tacked together into a frieze. But some sort of general history of ancient trade was much needed, especially to link together the special studies of particular fields of enterprise which have been fairly frequent of late.

Dr. Schaal does not pretend to be a specialist; but he has consulted good authorities throughout. He also knows when to be silent: a book about ancient commerce without any chapter on the Phoenicians, and with almost no reference to Phoenician shipping, except for traffic coastwise with Egypt,

is a novelty; though the old story of their tin-trade with Britain reappears (p. 79, 101-2). A more questionable omission concerns Carthage, and the Punic West generally (p. 101, 166-7): it is hardly possible to do justice, either to Alexandria or to the beginnings of Roman commerce, without some estimate of their great rival. In the same way, important as Ionian trade (and especially Milesian and Phocaeen) was, we should expect more explicit mention of Corinth and Syracuse, of Tarentum, and of the western Chalcidians: otherwise this many-headedness of Greek enterprise is not appreciated.

But there is a reason for these silences, in addition to the desultory origins of the book. Dr. Schaal has so much to say about the more recent discoveries, and especially about the voluminous archaeological evidence, and the tablet-literature of the Ancient East, that the conventional framework of narrative, based on literary and mainly on Greek sources, has had to be sacrificed to graphic detail and illustration. This makes the book harder to read and to use, increases its value as a

store of suggestive facts, and makes the reviewer deplore the lack of an index, and the restriction of the *Quellennachweise* to ancient documents.

A welcome feature, on the other hand, is the series of thirty-six plates, mostly photographic, illustrating all kinds of traded objects, methods of transport, commercial documents, and so forth.

Naturally, for German readers, special attention is given to the commercial and industrial intercourse between the Mediterranean centres and Germany and Gaul, but these countries are rightly presented as north-western counterparts to the maritime and overland traffic with the Indian Ocean and Central Asia, and to the Egyptian trade up Nile at all periods, for which so much evidence has come to light recently. In both directions the sketch maps of routes and of the distributions of finds are serviceable, though, as they give mere geographical outlines, they can only be used profitably in conjunction with a physical atlas.

J. L. MYRES.

Oxford.

CORINTH.

Ancient Corinth. With a topographical sketch of the Corinthia. Part I. By J. G. O'NEILL, Ph.D. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1930. Pp. xiii + 270; 8 photographs and 2 maps. Cloth, 22s. 6d.

THE present volume—the eighth of the Johns Hopkins Studies in Archaeology—deals with the history of Corinth from the earliest times down to the end of the Peloponnesian War; a second volume will carry the story on to the destruction of the city in 146. The book gives a good summary of the history of Corinth for the general student, but will probably be found most useful for its collection of references to both ancient and modern authors, and for its account of the few remains of the Greek city that have survived for the American excavators to discover. There is also a valuable survey of the topography of the Corin-

thia, based largely on the statements of previous travellers, but adequately reinforced by personal observation. In general, however, Mr. O'Neill has little to say that is new, and where he does venture to be original the result is not always fortunate; thus (p. 14) the fact that the battlements appear older than the rest of a wall is hardly evidence of a high antiquity. In dealing with the subject of Mycenaean Corinth the author rightly insists that the Corinthia must have been inhabited in the Late Helladic period, but the assumption that Corinth as well as Korakou was the site of a Mycenaean city can only be proved by the discovery of a Mycenaean settlement, and as long as the published results of excavations remain negative it seems premature for Mr. O'Neill to appeal to them in support of his hypothesis. Much of the next two chapters is taken up with tilting at two already ruined windmills,

the Phoenician theory and the wickedness and incompetence of ancient tyrants. The account of the Corinthian colonies is clear and easy to follow, but in dealing with Pheidon of Argos the author is again hampered by an inability to realise that different values have to be assigned to the statements of ancient and modern writers. When he comes to the Peloponnesian War, Mr. O'Neill puts up a good defence for the credibility of Thucydides as opposed to the economic theories of some modern historians; he takes adequate account both of ancient sources and of general probabilities in dealing with the actual war as well as the causes which led up to it, while the part played in the struggle by Corinth is related with admirable clearness and consistency. The coinage of Corinth is described in an appendix; some mention might have been made of the 'colts' issued by the Corinthian

colonies, and the general reader will probably regret the absence of any description of Corinthian pottery, although the main authorities on the subject are mentioned in a footnote. The book is illustrated by photographs of adequate clearness, though in most cases insufficient attention has been paid to background and lighting; it should have been possible to provide a more adequate plan of the territory of Corinth than a small photograph of Philippson's map. Both book and bibliography suggest that the author is too much oppressed by the views of his predecessors; he will do better original work when he realises that they too are human. This criticism does not impair the value of the book for purposes of reference, and it will probably find its way on to the shelves of most students of ancient history.

C. R. WASON.

Toronto.

INSCRIPTIONS AT CORINTH.

Corinth. Vol. VIII, Part I: *Greek Inscriptions*, 1896-1927. Edited by B. D. MERITT. Pp. vi+180; 147 photographs and 180 line drawings. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1931.

As we examine this record of the results of the excavations at Corinth, two impressions become dominant. The first is that of the meagreness of the epigraphical crop. Of the 331 texts comprised in this volume (which includes all the Greek inscriptions of Corinth now preserved there, even though they were not all discovered in the American excavations, with the exception of those on terra-cotta and the most recent discoveries made, since 1925, in the area of the theatre) only seven at the most are earlier than the fourth century B.C., and eighty-six are classed by the editor as Byzantine. Again, in 187 of these 'inscriptions' not a single word survives entire upon the stone, and in some of them not a single letter. How pitiful a harvest this appears when viewed against the background of the city's long and illustrious history! Are we to account for this by an appeal to

the oligarchical traditions of Corinth, resulting in the avoidance of publicity? Or is the blame to be laid on the shoulders of Mummius and of those who ruthlessly executed his orders for the destruction of the city?

But it is another impression which finally prevails—that of the thoroughness and the ability with which the editor has carried out a laborious and, in part, thankless task. The American School is fortunate in having had at its disposal so distinguished an epigraphist as Dr. Meritt, and he has done his work in such a way as to enhance a reputation already great and widespread. The use of epigraphical type with its often fallacious pretension to accuracy is discarded, and each inscription, with negligible exceptions, is accompanied by an excellent photograph or a carefully drawn facsimile. The *lemmata* are models of precision and brevity, the transcripts are clear, and the editor has shown admirable self-restraint in keeping his commentaries within narrow limits. Of the unpublished inscriptions, 228 in number, Nos. 11, 14, 15, 75, 130, 136 and 157 seem to me to be

the most interesting: 14 and 15 throw much-needed light on the Isthmian games, 130 is a pleasing bilingual epigram of the second century A.D., and 136 contains a curious and perfectly preserved, though anything but perfectly spelled, curse invoked upon disturbers of a tomb.

The work, beautifully printed in

Athens, is a model of careful proof-reading: omissions (e.g., the failure to note that No. 22 has been republished in Schwyzer, *Dial. graec. exempla*, 126a) are commendably few, and due attention has been paid to the indexes, which greatly increase the usefulness of the book.

M. N. TOD.

Oriel College, Oxford.

SCULPTURE AT CORINTH.

Corinth: Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Volume IX. Sculpture, 1896-1923. By FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON. Pp. xiv + 162, 289 figures in the text. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1931.

IN this volume Dr. Johnson catalogues and illustrates the stone and marble sculptures found in the American excavations at Corinth from their inception in 1896 down to 1923, except for some reliefs, which will be published with new fragments of the same series and other sculptures lately unearthed in the theatre. The catalogue contains 332 pieces, but only about a third have any real artistic or archaeological value—a poor harvest for nearly thirty years' work. Two are attributed to the prehistoric period and the rest all belong to the Roman age, thus emphasising the ruin done by Mummius. All large bronzes would of course have been taken to Italy, and the marbles that could not be moved would have been shattered. Pausanias saw a few pieces which were older than 146 B.C., and so in view of the broken condition of the sculptures of Roman date the complete lack of works of the classical period is perhaps not entirely due to Mummius. Roman Corinth, even though it has had a continuous history down to the present day, has often been ravaged by war and by earthquakes. Christian hostility to graven images and Turkish aversion to the representation of the human form have combined to reduce to pitiful fragments the large number of sculptures which adorned the city. Most of the better pieces have been published before, and two, the portrait of Herodes Atticus

and the sarcophagus with the Seven against Thebes, were not found in the excavations. Dr. Johnson, however, has done his work well, provided illustrations for all fragments of any size, and given the necessary references to previous literature, but he might have made the index fuller. The face called Mycenaean presents an interesting problem, for it was apparently covered with plaster over a painted surface. As no parallel can be given, its dating must remain uncertain for the present. The best known is the athlete head, found in the theatre—a copy of a fifth-century bronze represented by a well-preserved statue at Cleveland. This in some respects resembles the 'Apollo on the Omphalos' often attributed to Calamis, but the author, who dates it about 440 B.C., thinks it was the work of a sculptor who, while acquainted with the style of Polyclitus, was primarily influenced by Myron or someone like him. The bearded Dionysus is a feeble copy, and the six poorly executed draped female figures well illustrate the fashion for adapting fifth-century bronze types as bodies for portrait statues in the imperial period. A group of imperial portraits from the Julian basilica includes Augustus, his two grandsons Gaius and Lucius, and a fourth member of the Julio-Claudian family who has been called Tiberius (Swift), or Caligula (Poulsen), and is the same person as the portrait-type called Drusus son of Germanicus (Studniczka), Agrippa Postumus (Poulsen), or Drusus son of Tiberius (Taramelli). Dr. Johnson, who thinks it must be one of the sons of Germanicus, suggests Nero, because it does not appear to represent a vicious man. There is one good portrait each

of the first, second, third, and fourth centuries A.D., and the author suggests that the cross scratched on the forehead of the third-century head means that the person represented was an adherent or possibly a conspicuous opponent of the new religion. This seems a little far-fetched. Cases are known, as he says, where a cross was scratched on a work of art in early Christian times to sanctify what would otherwise have been ungodly. There is a good Hadrianic head resembling the Sappho type which comes from a high-relief, and a much damaged but attractive grave-

relief of the same date. A poor and fragmentary relief gives an imitation, but an inexact one, of the head of the Athena Parthenos. Architectural sculpture is well represented by the colossal Phrygians from a stoa which bordered the Agora and are probably of the second century also. Two fragments, Nos. 291 and 315, are good examples of the naturalistic Roman treatment of foliage. The four draped figures of the sixth century for all their crudity are interesting and excellently illustrate the transition from late Roman to Byzantine sculpture. A. J. B. WACE.

PHILOSOPHERS' TRIALS.

Les Procès d'Impiété intentés aux Philosophes à Athènes au V^{me} et au IV^{me} Siècles av. J.-C. Par E. DERENNE. Bibl. de la Fac. de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège: fasc. xlv. Pp. 271. Liège: Vaillant-Carmanne; Paris: Ed. Champion, 1930. Paper, 50 fr.

Polycratès, l'Accusation de Socrate, et le Gorgias. Par JEAN HUMBERT. Pp. 63. Paris: Klincksieck, 1930.

M. DERENNE gives us a very full account of all the known trials of philosophers for impiety at Athens. He discusses at length, with full, overfull, references to the opinions of others, the date and occasion of each trial, the political circumstances, the personality of the accusers, the verdict, and above all the nature of the charge, and the guilt, that is the true religious and philosophical position, of the defendant. He naturally therefore has to go over some very well-trodden ground; and though his argument and conclusions are mostly sane and sensibly written, he has not much that is new to suggest in any single case. Socrates' trial naturally occupies the most space; and in order to determine the nature of the charge and the reasons for the conviction, M. Derenne must deal at length with such questions as Socrates' attitude to science (especially to Anaxagoras) and to religion, the value of Aristophanes, Plato and Xenophon in general as historians of Socrates, and of the *Apologies* in particular, as well as

our other evidence for the trial, the personalities and aims of Meletus and Anytus, and the meaning of the phrase *νομίζων θεούς*. In all but the last he agrees on the whole with the views of Burnet and Taylor. He has a particularly good discussion of the political and economic conditions in the years after the Restoration, and of Anytus' position: his dislike of all 'thinkers,' upsetters of received opinion (he might have been compared with Cleon, also a tanner, also a democrat and an opponent of the *σοφοί*, if we may trust Thucydides, and, according to one version, a prosecutor of Anaxagoras), his determination to preserve the settlement of 403, at a time when there was still danger of renewed conflict.

For Anaxagoras' trial he rejects the view of Taylor (C.Q. XI.) that it took place about 450, and supports the older view that it took place in 432. For this he has good arguments; he takes *ἤρξατο δὲ φιλοσοφεῖν Ἀθήνησιν ἐπὶ Καλλίου* (= Καλλιᾶδου, 480 B.C.) *ἐπὶ εἴκοσι ὥν, ὡς φησι Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῇ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀναγραφῇ* (Diog. Laert. ii 7 = Diels, *Vors.*⁴ i, p. 375) as meaning that Anaxagoras began to study philosophy at the age of twenty, when Calliades was archon at Athens; rightly, I think. On the other hand, the best positive argument for the later date, namely that Diopiteithes' activity lay between the years 435 and 415, depends on the identification of the *χρησμολόγος* with the mover of the

decree against atheists and astronomers; and this is by no means certain, even though the Schol. Ar. Av. 988 says the *χρησμολόγος* was also *ρήτωρ*. We only have Plutarch's statement that Diopieithes moved the resolution to impeach; this may come ultimately from Craterus; but Derenne's view, 's'il y avait eu à Athènes, à la même époque, deux orateurs du même nom, on aurait sans doute nommé l'auteur du décret plus explicitement, de façon à empêcher toute confusion,' argues a lack of familiarity with the forms of Attic decrees.¹ He is very wrong, by the way, in speaking of a *χρησμολόγος* as 'un personnage à demi officiel.'

He gives a full account of the trial of Protagoras, dating it to 416, without mentioning Burnet's view that it never took place. Yet this view is the most probable, though Burnet was wrong in supposing that Protagoras was not in Athens after 432; he was there in 421 (Athen. v 218B), as Derenne points out. For, apart from the many contradictions in the story as given by our authorities, *Meno* 91E-92D is practically decisive: a passage which not only states that Protagoras' good name was unsullied throughout his long life, but as nearly as possible explicitly asserts that he was never prosecuted. And this raises a more important question—the value of our authorities, especially of Diogenes Laertius, on such matters: a question which Derenne, though often

¹ Still less certain is the identification with the *χρησμολόγος* who was consulted in 367 at Sparta as to the successor to Agis; neither Xenophon nor Plutarch calls the latter an Athenian.

Derenne answers one of Taylor's arguments, that Plato never represents Socrates as having been in personal contact with Anaxagoras, as follows: 'Platon avait peut-être d'excellentes raisons de ne pas présenter Socrate en relations avec Anaxagore. Sans doute ne se souciait-il guère de mettre en scène Socrate conversant avec un astronome condamné pour impiété, alors que l'on avait précisément reproché à son maître de s'occuper de météorologie et d'astronomie.' This must be nearly the thinnest argument on record; but it can be matched: for example, by Beloch in support of his view that there was a large Spartan force at Thermopylae: 'und endlich: würde die Inschrift so viel Wesens davon machen, dass sie τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πευθόμενοι gefallen wären, wenn sie nicht Kameraden gehabt hätten, von denen man das nicht rühmen konnte?'

touching upon it in matters of detail, does not discuss in principle. But his judgment is generally sound; though, like so many others, he will often use an orator's statement as though it contained the literal and the whole truth: here, for example, statements about the law of impiety and verdicts given, as Dem. xxi 175-182, xxv 79-80, lix 73-7, 116-7, to prove strong Athenian feeling on the matter, as though the result of the Meidias case itself should not serve as a warning. (And Derenne even goes one better than the orator: Dem. lix 116-7 does not state that Archias the hierophant was condemned to death.)

The other cases dealt with in this book are those of Demades, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Stilpon and Theodorus: none of which is interesting. Then in two concluding chapters Derenne deals with the law and the procedure common to them all, and the theory of state interference with religious belief. It is from the first of these that most was to be hoped, and it is here that we are most disappointed. The author has little new to tell (which is not his fault), and his views are unconvincing. He maintains that Diopieithes' law (renewed in its essentials in 403, with a change of procedure, *εἰσαγγελία* being abolished) is the basis of all the prosecutions against philosophers, and that this specifically aimed at (1) unbelief in the gods, or the city's gods; (2) innovation, either in ritual or by the introduction of new gods; and (3) astronomy. He thinks in particular that all the prosecutions included a charge of innovation, and that, in spite of the right of association, new deities could not be worshipped at Athens without the sanction of the state. But there is no evidence that Diopieithes introduced a new law; he proposed and carried a psephisma that certain persons should be impeached, that is that the already existing law against impiety should be put in action. That law, doubtless dating from Solon, will have included in it provision against innovation in religious practice, in rites and sacrifices, meaning primarily falsification in the public rites (as well as against sacrilege); but there is no reason to suppose that it included

express injunctions against unbelief simply, or against new divinities; though prejudice could be raised against a man on those grounds as easily in Athens as elsewhere. The priestess Ninos (Dem. xix 281-2) was prosecuted, according to Derenne, mainly for conducting a *thiasos* not part of the state religion or expressly permitted by decree, Phryne for practically the same; but this the evidence makes highly improbable. If the citizens of Citium resident in Athens had to get the sanction of a decree of the demos to build a temple of Aphrodite (this inscription he quotes from *I.G.* ii 168, instead of ii² 337), that is not because Aphrodite was a new deity, but because they were foreigners, who could only obtain land by special permission and for a special purpose, and this purpose is necessarily mentioned in the decree as a condition of the grant. The quashing therefore of Sophocles' decree in 307, which did aim at state regulation, on the ground of illegality, did not introduce a new principle, as Derenne supposes, but confirmed an old one—the right of association, as laid down by Solon. Derenne explains the frequent introduction of new divinities in the fifth and fourth centuries by supposing that in a state where there was no public prosecutor and no regular police the law was not frequently enforced. But I had always supposed that at Athens informers were only too ready to prosecute.

M. Humbert's interestingly-written work deals with one part only of one case, the shadowy figure Polycrates, who lost a fortune and turned sophist for money, his nebulous pamphlet the *κατηγορία Σωκράτους* (dated, on the slenderest grounds, to 393-2), and its connexion with the *Gorgias*. Others have insisted on that connexion; but M. Humbert writes well, and almost convincingly, on the difference of tone in the *Gorgias*, or rather in its second half, the dialogue with Calicles, from that both of earlier works, as *Apology*

and *Criton*, and later ones, *Menon* and the first book of the *Republic* (if that is later): the *Gorgias* is much bitterer against Athens and her leading statesmen. This he thinks is due to the appearance of Polycrates' pamphlet, in which the chief charge against Socrates was that he was the enemy of democracy, and the teacher of oligarchs. The *Gorgias* therefore is also to be dated 393-2. I am not however convinced by his treatment of the central point in the argument—the famous quotation from Pindar in 484b: here he follows Wilamowitz in keeping the reading of Plato's MSS. *βιαιῶν τὸ δίκαιότατον* (with *βιαιῶν* as a verb: not recognised in Liddell and Scott), but, unlike Wilamowitz, does not regard this as a lapse of memory on Plato's part (for *δικαιῶν τὸ βιαιότατον*), but as an intended misquotation, put into the mouth of Calicles, in whom he finds many of the traits of Polycrates, because Polycrates had, for his own evil purposes, misquoted in the same way. He has some support from Libanius for this, but hardly enough.

As the date of the *Gorgias* is of importance, it is worth noting the argument for the date of Polycrates' pamphlet. In it there was mention of the rebuilding of the Long Walls, and, apparently, praise of Conon and of Thrasybulus; but 'on a remarqué que cette glorification . . . n'est concevable qu'aussi longtemps que leur cité les considéra comme de grands hommes. Or Conon disparut bientôt de la scène politique, après son arrestation (392-391); Thrasybule, longtemps avant sa mort, était discrédité'; so only the years 393 and 392 remain. There is some bad history in this: but apart from that, this is equivalent to arguing that Miltiades could not be praised after 489, and that any eulogy of Asquith must date from before 1916.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

PLATO AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

Plato and his Contemporaries. By G. C. FIELD. Pp. ix + 242. London: Methuen, 1930. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

UNTIL recently the English student had few books to help him in a general study of the Platonic dialogues. But happily the gap has been filled by Professor Taylor's survey of their contents, and now by this most helpful account of their background.

In its scope *Plato and his Contemporaries* is the companion to *Plato: the Man and his Work*, but in its outlook it is its polite but decided opponent. 'The presupposition of the treatment,' says the author, 'is the view which I have expounded in the course of it, that Plato's chief interest in all his activities lay in his own age and its problems.' To impress and defend this view is one of the chief purposes of this book, and one which must be welcomed, for there is little written from this side of the Socratic question to which the ordinary student can easily refer. At the same time, the real battlefield in the Socratic controversy is found in the Theory of Ideas (hence the author's inclusion of appendices on this subject), and not in the proper subject of this book. For (p. 108) 'the developments of the fourth century' are 'the continuation and intensification of the tendencies which were already showing themselves clearly in the Peloponnesian War,' so that even if we regard the Socratic dialogues as fifth-century history we may—and should—admit that the history was written because it applied as aptly to the circumstances of the fourth. Hence the few points in which the author claims that Plato's language suits the fourth century and not the fifth are of small consequence and do little to strengthen his argument. Those parts of the book which are really most useful for the study of the Socratic question appear only as supplements—the note to Chapter IV., which is a 'summary of the evidence on the Socratic question,' but notable for its omission of all evidence on the unorthodox side, and the appendices on

'Aristotle and the Theory of Ideas' and 'The Post-Aristotelian Tradition.'

But, apart from controversy, an appreciation of the practical object of the dialogues and of the practical, as well as the mystical, side of their author is essential to a proper understanding of most of Plato, and this is the chief lesson taught by the excellent account of Plato's life (in which, by the way, the author not only accepts the evidence of the Epistles, but is also inclined to believe in the journey to Egypt and the kidnapping), and the most interesting section on the general political and moral background.

In the section on the Socratic literature the author has given useful translations from the unfamiliar fragments of Aeschines. His conclusion here is the sane one that 'we must naturally expect to find all degrees of accuracy in the Socratic writings' (p. 137). But while, in accordance with this, he makes a most convincing defence of the general historical value of the *Memorabilia*, his main implication here—although he admits the weakness of the argument (p. 157)—seems to be that the unhistorical character of the *Oeconomicus* confirms a belief in the unhistorical character of the Platonic dialogues. On the other hand, the idealising of historical characters, discussed mainly on pp. 134-5, is surely not merely, as he states, a feature of this particular period, but a normal tendency illustrated not only by the constitution of Draco but also by the cases of Harmodius and Aristogiton, and probably Lycurgus and Homer.

In dealing with the authorities for the Socratic philosophers the author is as incredulous as he was (excusably) credulous in dealing with those for the life of Plato. He is here prepared to accept little beyond the scanty contemporary evidence, and is thus compelled to follow the latest tendency and reject the traditions which make Aristippus, Antisthenes and Phaedo the founders of philosophic schools. Among all of them he finds little philosophic achievement beyond the work of Antisthenes

and Euclides in logic and methodology. Similarly he leaves to the Pythagoreans of the age only their achievements in the special sciences. There will doubtless come a reaction to the present revolutionary attitude which this represents, but when the records are so confused and late it is a good thing to lay the foundation of fact securely before an attempt is made to rebuild theories or to sort out probabilities from improbabilities.

In conclusion mention must be made of the fluent, lucid style and convincing commonsense method of argument, which make even the more intricate sections of the book a pleasure to read. But this is not a book merely to read and then lay aside; the serious student of Plato will want to keep it for regular reference to its well-documented facts and sound judgments upon them.

K. W. LUCKHURST.

Edinburgh.

ROME AND THE ROMANS.

Rome and the Romans. A Survey and Interpretation. By GRANT SHOWERMAN. Pp. xxii + 463; maps and illustrations. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931. Cloth, 21s. net.

THIS is the work of a distinguished professor, whose chief aim is to impress on American readers the connexion of their civilisation with the Roman; the survival of Roman influences in American life, linguistic, social, legal, economic, etc., considering differences as well as resemblances. This plan is carried out in four sections: (1) Rome and its meaning, the city and state; (2) The Roman as a person, a study of the man in his home-environment and habits; (3) Living Rome, a collective study of the Roman in his civic and vocational capacities, a public scene of ambitions, professions, amusements, etc., that found place in the life of the great city; (4) Greater Rome, the spread of Roman civilisation law security and commerce, the vast material remains of Roman architecture and engineering in far-off lands, the coming of Christianity, and the eternity of Roman power that has outlasted her Empire's fall.

It is a great undertaking, and one not lightly to be criticised in its performance. Clearly it needs room if its utterances are to be expressed with sufficient fullness of detail and guarded by cautious reservations. In reading it I have felt that the author is pinched for want of space. If the American reader can here and there supply instructive detail or qualify crudely-positive assertions, well and good. But if he is meant to take each assertion at

face-value as final, not so well. Endeavouring to account for a compression that I lament, I have come to the conclusion that the work is overladen with illustrations. The book proper has in all 643 pages. But of these 52 are either blank or devoted to full-page pictures or maps. The 140 part-page pictures occupy a space not less than 80 pages. Index and other summaries at the end account for 51 more. Hence the room available for dealing with the wide range of topics is only 460 pages; and these with generous type are far from spacious. Therefore I complain that the text is unduly pinched.

The present craze for illustrative pictures seems to me overdone. In this book many of them are not truly relevant to their setting. Some would be more instructive if on a larger scale; such as (*e.g.*) the Forum 'restored' are not clear. Pictures borrowed from one book to serve another are seldom satisfactory. The views of the Capitol at Washington, the Mississippi State Capitol at Jackson, and the Great Hall of Pennsylvania Terminal in New York, are a characteristic feature of this work. You are ever being reminded of the main object. And the description of the dome (p. 6) seems to ignore the difference of structures. Again, in depicting Roman houses it is risky to rely too much on the remains of Pompeii as typically Roman. Indeed 'Roman' as a comprehensive epithet is never very clearly defined, and 'civilisation' is ever a pitfall. On page 29 we read, 'the civilisation in which we (U.S.A.) live is descended from that of ancient Rome,'

and so on in an eloquent passage. But surely the composite nature of 'Roman' civilisation is just the most striking point in it, and of this the admissions made incidentally below are not a sufficient recognition.

Professor Showerman has written other books on a larger scale, a glance at which justifies me in a certain dissatisfaction with the one before me. I found at once an illustration both relevant and good, and an ample text. He has served with distinction on the staff of the American Academy at Rome, and he often shows (as in Ch. XXIV.) that he has seen much of Italy with open eyes. So I wonder how he can reconcile the *Calabria* (modern) and the ancient, given in the maps on pages 8 and 24, with the statement in the text of page 8. This is a specimen of the small matters on which it would be

pedantry to dwell. Reconsideration of *liberti* (p. 71), *sequestris* (180), and 'pike or javelin' (458-9) may be desired.

But I miss a frank and adequate treatment of two topics which the aim of the book seems certainly to demand. First, the importance of slavery in its many subtle modes of influence is not sufficiently stressed even in Ch. XXIII. Secondly, the amazing contrast between the characteristic structures of the Roman Empire and the American Republic—I mean the vital difference in the relations of the Whole and Parts—is not openly recognised at all. Yet in a sketch embracing the developments of some 2,500 years a comparison of the two fabrics as to origin and function would surely not be out of place.

W. E. HEITLAND.

St. John's College,
Cambridge.

MAKERS OF EUROPE.

Makers of Europe. By R. S. CONWAY.

Pp. 83. Harvard University Press;
London: Milford, 1931. Cloth, 6s.

IN these four lectures, delivered on the James Henry Morgan Foundation at Dickinson College, Professor Conway seeks to show that Cicero, Horace, and Virgil were largely responsible for modern ideals of government, and especially of justice in international relations. Caesar, the subject of the first lecture, is regarded merely as the destroyer of a corrupt system, and Professor Conway is at some pains to point out what has long been generally admitted—that Mommsen, the ardent partisan of Caesar, is biassed by the enthusiasm for empire-builders so natural to a German of his time. Cicero, on the other hand, is represented as a great political thinker, in some respects the superior of Plato and Aristotle; while in the third and fourth lectures we are shown Horace and Virgil, by statesmanlike precepts and humanitarian ideals, turning the bloodthirsty young Octavian into the mellow and benign Augustus.

Whatever view we may take of the treatment of Caesar and Cicero—and many will feel that Professor Conway

is less than fair to Caesar's achievements, and will continue to look on Cicero as a master of language rather than of thought—it is the lectures on Horace and Virgil that are most certain to provoke criticism. Professor Conway is himself aware of this, and fulminates against the blinking pedagogues who will be reluctant to follow him. After all, the pedagogues have a case. Horace and Virgil were 'court poets,' the expression to which Professor Conway objects, not in the sense that they would praise anything for money, but as being the mouthpieces of a government policy which genuinely appealed to them. We are asked to believe that they influenced that policy. This is to press too hard the phrase about poets as the unacknowledged legislators of the world. If Professor Conway were right, we should expect some confirmation from the ancient authorities; but all we hear is to the opposite effect—that Maecenas suggested the subject of the *Georgics*, Augustus that of the *Aeneid*, that Horace was instructed to write the *Carmen Saeculare* and an ode on the victories of Tiberius and Drusus. Augustus appreciated Virgil and Horace as great poets; there is no evidence, and no probability,

that he regarded them as his masters in political thought.

What is their teaching in so far as they are political thinkers? Professor Conway would have us look upon Virgil, in particular, as a sort of John the Baptist to the League of Nations. What is most extraordinary, he quotes in support of his view the famous 'Tu regere imperio.' That passage, for anyone but Professor Conway, is an expression of imperialism; Virgil indeed desires a world at peace, but at peace, he makes it plain, because it has been subdued by Rome. Are we to suppose him

more indignant than Horace apparently was (*Odes* I 29) at the wanton attack on Arabia Felix, about the only remaining country that the Romans thought rich enough to be worth conquering? While Professor Conway wishes Mommsen's history, on account of its loose statements and imperialist bias, 'publicly burnt in the playground of every school and college,' he seems more lenient to loose statements justifying 'principles of government on which Englishmen and Americans are in complete agreement.' K. R. POTTER.

University of Edinburgh.

A NEW TEXT OF CICERO'S LETTERS TO ATTICUS.

M. Tulli Ciceronis ad Atticum Epistularum libri sedecim. Recensuit H. SJÖGREN. Fasciculus secundus, libros V.-VIII. continens. Göteborg: Eranos' Förlag, 1929. Paper, kr. 6.50.

'IN epistulis ad Atticum recensendis editores Mediceo illo celeberrimo pro fundamento antea usos, quippe qui solus examinatus esset, non numquam errasse nunc documento est ceterorum codicum consensus.' In these words, written some twenty years ago, Dr. Sjögren indicated the principles upon which his edition is founded. These principles are fully set forth in the preface to the first fasciculus (1916), containing *Att.* I.-IV. Briefly, the editor holds that of the two classes into which our extant MSS. are divided, Σ and Δ, Σ has the superior authority. Indeed, a MS. of this class, E, is the oldest existing MS., except the scanty Würzburg fragments (W), of the eleventh century. Further, in his view, the Medicean, though the oldest and best of the Δ group, has been so carelessly transcribed that its readings must often be considered in the light of evidence supplied by other MSS. even of its own class. He therefore gives a new collation, not only of seven of the best Σ MSS., but also of the Medicean and four other Δ MSS. Hence the significant feature of this edition is undoubtedly its *apparatus criticus*. This surpasses anything of the kind hitherto available, and will form the basis for the study of these Letters for many years to come. It is not only what it

professes to be—a fresh collation of our MS. authority, containing many readings hitherto unknown—it is also a storehouse of references both to the work of modern scholarship on this subject and to parallel passages in support of the editor's views, so that it largely performs the part of a commentary as well. The reader is constantly impressed by the width of the editor's erudition and by his delicate feeling for minute parallels of expression, thought, or situation. Nothing seems to escape him. He possesses two at least of Caesar's virtues: 'hoc *τέρας* horribili vigilantia et diligentia est.'

The text of this fasciculus is not sensational. It contains nothing so startling as what appeared in its predecessor, which at *Att.* I. 14. 5 added a new word—'commulcium'—even to the *Thesaurus*. So far as I have noticed, the editor prints not more than five conjectures of his own. These will be found at V. 2. 3 ('operae'), V. 10. 3 ('belle'), VII. 1. 8, VII. 3. 7, VIII. 7. 1 ('XX'). Of these, two at least appear to me valuable suggestions:

VII. 1. 8. In the Oxford text (and others) this passage runs: 'ad eos ego (sc. scribam) et iam antea scripsi ad ipsum Hirrum,' with no indication of the MS. reading. Yet this text involves Cicero in a flat contradiction: a few lines below he states distinctly that he has *not* written to Hirrus. We now know that NP (the only two Σ MSS. here available) read: 'ad eos *etiam*

antea scripsi *et iam* (om. Δ) ad ipsum Hirrum' (sc. scribam). Here the first 'etiam' is pointless, and Sj. therefore proposes to omit it as due to a careless anticipation of the 'etiam' following—a common form of error (cf. *Com. Tull.* 67): 'I have already written to Scrofa and Silius, and now (I shall write) to Hirrus himself.' For the ellipse of 'scribam' after 'scripsi' cf. *Ep.* IX. 23. 1.

VII. 3. 7. The MSS. give 'antea negligentes fuimus sed *et* amicorum multitudine occupati.' The edd. silently omit 'et.' Sj. preserves it, reading 'et amicorum (*et alienorum*) multitudine,' which is strongly supported by *Q.F.* I. 2. 16, *Ep.* I. 9. 17.

The new feature of this edition, however, is not conjectural emendation, but, on the contrary, its defence of the tradition against conjecture. The places where Sj. proposes to restore the MS. text, which previous scholars have altered, are very numerous. Only a few examples can be given here:

V. 10. 3: 'etsi haec ipsa fero equidem fronte, ut puto, et vultu bellissime': so previous edd., ignoring or ignorant of the fact that Δ has 'etiam fronte,' and both Δ and Σ (i.e. Ω) 'volo' for 'vultu.' Cicero says (V. 1. 3) 'animo et vultu' and (V. 1. 4) 'verbis vultuque,' but 'fronte et vultu' seems an excess of expression. Sj. restores the MSS.: 'haec ipsa fero equidem *etiam* fronte, ut puto *et volo*, belle' (codd. 'bellis'), comparing *Ep.* VIII. 4. 2 'ut spero et volo,' and for 'belle' *Att.* IV. 18. 2 'quo modo fero? belle mehercule.'

V. 20. 1: 'inde oppidis iis, quae erant, mirabiliter accepti.' Previous edd. insert 'in' and obelize 'quae erant.' Neither view seems necessary: 'accipere,' 'excipere,' 'recipere' frequently occur c. abl. (cf. *Verr.* V. 147: *Caes. B.G.* II. 3. 3: *B.C.* III. 103), and for 'quae erant,' 'in the towns that were there,' implying a scanty number, cf. *Ep.* II. 11. 2: 'mira paucitas est et eas, quae erant, valde aiunt queri.' Cicero continues: 'quod idem Apameae . . . fecimus': so Σ , but after 'idem' M shows a lacuna of some seven letters, followed by 'dein' (so Δ) 'Apameae.' Hence Schiche inserted 'Colossis' after 'idem' ('quod idem Colossis dein Apameae . . . fecimus'), and his conjecture

has been generally accepted. But we now know for the first time that there is no trace of a lacuna either in Σ or in three of the Δ MSS. collated by Sj., 'unde apparet,' he concludes, 'archetypum Ω hoc loco non hiasse.' Further, neither in similar itineraries (*Ep.* XV. 4. 2: *Att.* V. 16. 2) nor elsewhere does Cicero mention Colossae: it was quite a small place, close to the capital, Laodicea, to which the Colossenses would naturally resort for the assizes. Cf. Hunter, *J.R.S.* III., p. 73, who, though unaware of the MS. evidence, also objects to the insertion of Colossae here. Thus the 'dein' of M becomes superfluous with 'idem,' and is probably to be omitted (with Σ) as due to a ditto-graphy of the latter word (*idem dein*)—a form of error to which Δ is constantly liable (cf. II. 16. 2: 'si Bibulus' Σ , 'sibi Bibulus' Δ : IV. 17. 2 'quise' Σ , 'qui se qui se' Δ : *Q.F.* III. 1. 20 'valde te' Σ , 'valde de te' Δ). Hence Sj. restores the text of Σ , 'quod idem Apameae.'

VI. 1. 17. Here again the new collation restores a passage which previous edd. had marked as corrupt: 'ea statua quae ad Opis tper tet posita est.' We now find that Σ and Δ (i.e. Ω) concur in reading 'quae ab Opis parte posita est': cf. *Ov. M.* XV. 740 'laterum a parte duorum,' *Cic. Phil.* VI. 12 'aspicite illam a sinistra equestrem statuum.'

VI. 9. 1: 'quae solent tuae (i.e. "literulae": "handwriting") compositissimae': so Sj. with MSS. All previous edd. either omit 'tuae' or read 'quia' for 'quae,' although they accept without a murmur VI. 6. 3 'quas multo ante tuas acceperam' and VII. 1. 9 'quas ille meas tractat.'

VIII. 5. 1. Few conjectures have been more generally received than Bosius' 'cerritior' for the MS. 'certior' here. Cicero is referring to his surprise at the sudden return of Dionysius, the tutor of the young Cicerones: 'etsi solet eum, cum aliquid furiose fecit, paenitere. Nunquam autem certior fuit quam in hoc negotio.' This seems entirely satisfactory. I admit, says Cicero, that D usually thinks better of these tantrums of his: 'but never did I know him more determined than he was in this business.' Lehmann had

long ago defended the MSS. here, and 'certior' is now restored by Sj.

VIII. 9. 2: 'quod (C) nunc ipsum unde' (all MSS.) 'recipienti, quid agenti, quid acturo?' Cicero complains that Atticus and Peducaeus have consented to join a deputation to meet Caesar at the fifth milestone on his return from Brundisium. *Quod* is of course corrupt: but *unde* seems needlessly altered by Boot, whom recent edd. follow, reading: 'quid . . . de se recipienti': 'pledging himself to what course?' This gives mere tautology with the words 'quid agenti, quid acturo,' which add nothing to 'recipienti.' Sj. adopts Wesenberg's fine restoration of the passage: 'quo nunc ipsum unde se recipienti,' etc.: 'though he is returning, at this very juncture, whither (and) whence, with what designs in the present, what in the future?' *quo, i.e. 'Romam': unde, i.e. 'a civili bello': nunc ipsum, i.e. 'optimatibus devictis.'* For 'quo unde,'

cf. Madvig, § 492, and for the form of expression, VIII. 16. 2 'qua se referret et quo.'

VIII. 9a 2 (= 9. 4): 'metuo ne omnis haec dementia ad unam illam crudelitatem colligatur.' Here again the MSS. are defended against a host of conjectures (*Cinnam, Sullanam, etc.*). 'Vnam' seems supported by the opposition of 'colligatur': 'zu einem grossen Akt der Grausamkeit' (Ed. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie*, p. 297).

This list could be largely increased. The above examples may suffice to illustrate the editor's independence of judgment, his mastery of the critical problem, and his delicate linguistic sense. One of the most interesting and important of recent classical works deserved earlier notice. The delay has been due to an accident.

W. T. VESEY.

Gonville and Caius College,
Cambridge.

VIRGIL'S HALF-LINES.

Half-Lines and Repetitions in Virgil.

By JOHN SPARROW. Pp. 156. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931. Cloth, 10s.

It is orthodox to hold that none of the incomplete lines in Virgil would have remained had the poet lived to revise his work. Mr. Sparrow urges that this has not been proved. The majority of half-lines belong to passages clearly incomplete or clearly afterthoughts; this does not prove that the minority are not in finished passages. No other poet of antiquity uses broken lines; this does not prove that Virgil was not an innovator. Of course logical demonstration of the orthodox view is not possible, but a very strong presumption in its favour has been established. Hence when Mr. Sparrow examines all the incomplete lines and finds sixteen of which he can say that if Virgil intended to leave any he might have left any of these, the conclusion is somewhat barren.

The second part of the book is much more important. An analysis of the repetitions in Virgil leads to the result that all true repetitions within a work are either carefully designed for some

rhetorical or poetical effect, or accidental and unconscious. They are never intended as an imitation of so-called epic repetition. Besides these there are false repetitions where a passage marked in Virgil's mind for deletion in one place was used in another, or where repetition is due to interpolation. Such has been the view of many, and it is very valuable to have it confirmed by a thorough study of the evidence.

This analysis also has an importance for textual criticism. The only explanation of such a divergence as *A. xii 46 exsuperat magis aegrescitque medendo PR . . . ardescitque tuendo M* (cf. *A. i 713 expleri mentem nequit ardescitque tuendo*) is that it arises from the marginal or interlinear ascription of parallel or illustrative passages. More commonly variants are produced either of which makes sense and one of which repeats another line. In such cases it is not safe to follow the majority of MSS. The minority should be preferred if they give the unpeated phrase. Mr. Sparrow notes the following places where he would differ from

the Oxford text: *G.* iii 426, iv 331; *A.* i 428, ii 448, iii 527, iv 243, 646, v 162, vii 281, 737, viii 620, 680, xi 202, 901, xii 24, 309. We thus see that the text of Virgil was exposed to a peculiar danger. In fourteen of these passages the right reading was preserved in only one MS. In how many places, then, has it disappeared completely? And how

often has a complete line been foisted into the text in this way? Mr. Sparrow discusses a number of lines, usually previously questioned, to which his suspicions have been drawn. All this forms a useful corrective to over-hasty confidence in the early MSS.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

A Short History of the Roman Empire to the Death of Marcus Aurelius. By J. WELLS and R. H. BARROW. Pp. viii+399; 8 maps. London: Methuen, 1931. Cloth, 6s.

AT the time of his death the late Dr. Wells was engaged in writing a companion volume to his well-known short history of the Roman Republic, the completion of which was entrusted to the competent hands of Mr. R. H. Barrow. More than half of the present volume is the work of Mr. Barrow, who has also revised the unfinished chapters left by Dr. Wells. The result is a book which forms an excellent introduction to the study of the Principate, and which even University students will find it useful to consult.

The first problem which confronts an historian of the Principate is one of method. How far is he to narrate events in their chronological order, and how far is he to discuss systematically the problems of government and administration which had to be faced by the Roman government throughout the whole period? The former method, although it involves the repetition of much familiar material, must be employed in a book intended for beginners: a history of the Principate for advanced students might well consist almost entirely of essays on particular points. On the whole the volume before us compromises sensibly in this matter. Separate chapters are devoted to frontier questions, to the conquest and occupation of Britain, to the treatment of Christianity, and to social and economic conditions.

As this book is likely to be widely used, attention may be drawn to a few statements which seem to the present reviewer to be erroneous or misleading. (P. 5) It is asserted too definitely that Augustus received proconsular imperium in 27 B.C. (P. 13) The statement that under Augustus auxiliary units were commanded by young members of the equestrian order requires much modification (Cheesman, *Auxilia*, p. 91; Stein, *Röm. Ritterstand*, p. 142). The Prefecture of the Praetorians did not normally win 'for its holder admission to the Senate when the post was resigned.' Surely the usual reward was the *ornamenta consularia*. (P. 32) The statement that magistrates of *municipia* gained citizenship applies of course only to Latin towns. (P. 34) It is highly unlikely that the well-known passage of St. Luke refers to the census of 27 B.C. (P. 137) It seems a pity to accept Henderson's untenable theory of the first battle of Bedriacum. (P. 155) The view that Corbulo borrowed a legion from Germany has been shown by Parker (*Legions*, p. 135) to be improbable. (P. 199) Domitian's settlement of Dacia should not be described offhand as 'ignominious to Rome': parallels can be found in the treatment by Rome of the Marcomanni, of the kingdom of the Bosphorus, and of Armenia. Finally, the appendix on 'The Treasuries' (p. 379) simplifies the problem too much. It should, for instance, not be stated dogmatically that the *aerarium* received the revenue of senatorial provinces.

G. H. STEVENSON.

University College, Oxford.

COINS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum. Vol. II.: Vespasian to Domitian. By H. MATTINGLY, M.A. Pp. cv+485; 83 plates. London: By Order of the Trustees of the British Museum, 1930. £3 3s.

By the publication of the second volume of its Catalogue of Roman Imperial Coins eight years after the appearance of the first, the British Museum has advanced one stage further towards the completion of a work as nearly definitive as any Corpus of archaeological material is likely to be. Only three or four other cities contain collections even comparable with London's, and the thoroughness with which the work has been carried out is illustrated by the facts that besides the 894 varieties of the coinage of Vespasian which the Museum possesses, 402 from other collections are fully described, and that 626 are reproduced in the plates. It is not too much to say that for the numismatist no such body of material has ever before been made accessible. For readers of this review the interest of the work will be mainly historical, and from this point of view its use is facilitated both by the arrangement of the coins chronologically under the various mints—a system of classification in the development of which Mr. Mattingly has played a very large part, and by the admirable introductions in which he has discussed such problems as the chronology of the imperial titles and offices, and the significance, constitutional, political, religious, and social, of many of the issues. It is especially in relation to these latter problems that the Flavian coinage is historically important. Thus at the outset, coins of 68-70 show Vespasian's determination to found a dynasty, by representations of Titus and Domitian as magistrates seated in curule chairs, and by legends referring to their offices and titles. Throughout the reign this policy is stressed, and the emphasis laid on it increases after 75. The Emperor's realisation that his was in fact a parvenu dynasty is illustrated by coins which associate him with Galba by such

legends as *Libertas Restituta*, *Adsertori Libertatis Publicae*, *Ob Cives Servatos*, or by his repetitions of issues of Galba, *Concordia Senatui*, etc. The same conception underlies the greater definiteness of his titles, as in the special titulature invented when Titus had received the *proconsulare imperium*. The son does not use the title Imp. T. Caesar, which would equate his possession of it with his father's, but is T. Caesar Imp. Vespasianus. The title is not a mere honorary cognomen, but is still not the *praenomen imperatoris* itself.

Most striking of all is the way in which Vespasian challenges comparison with the founder of the Principate, Augustus himself, by striking coins with Augustan reverses, and those especially which show him as the restorer of peace and prosperity. Throughout his reign Vespasian continues with increasing stress to emphasise this aspect of his rule. *Salus*, *Pax*, *Securitas*, *Felicitas*, *Ceres* and *Annona*, *Aequitas*, and the like are the common types which bring before the Empire the good times it now enjoys, reminding it of the golden age of Augustus, which have succeeded the oppression of Nero and the horrors of the civil war. Besides these general inferences which the coinage allows us to draw we gain light also on matters of detail. Mr. Mattingly's study of the coins has led him to maintain in the much-disputed matter of the date of Agricola's governorship the older view assigning its beginning to 78 rather than 77; the appearance on the *Aes* coinage under Domitian of a new reverse type and legend *Moneta Augusti* clearly implies a closer relation of the Emperor with the Senatorial mint than can be proved before, though we cannot yet say how complete his control of it had become. Such are a few gleanings from the rich store of historical material which the new volume provides.

The collection and successful arrangement of so vast a mass of material is a task before which criticism might well stand silent, and it is perhaps ungracious to make a suggestion which would add to it, but for the historical

student, less familiar than the numismatist with the technique of classification in this field, the addition of the catalogue numbers to the many coins discussed in the introduction would be a considerable boon.

Of the volume itself it may be said that the letterpress in clearness and accuracy maintains the high standard we have learnt to expect from the Oxford University Press; that the colotype plates are admirably arranged and produced; and that the binding is

also that to which previous British Museum Catalogues of coins have accustomed us—ugly in colour, mean in appearance, and quite inadequate in strength. But for the material which this unprepossessing exterior conceals we have nothing but admiration. We congratulate Mr. Mattingly on another instalment of his monumental work, and we await with impatience the appearance of its successor.

D. ATKINSON.

University of Manchester.

A LEXICON TO JOSEPHUS.

A Lexicon to Josephus. Compiled by HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, M.A., Hon. D.D. Published for the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, by the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation. Part I, A to ἀργός. Pp. x+80. 10" x 13¾". Paris: Geuthner, 1930. Paper, 60 fr.

THE preface, written by Dr. Thackeray, is dated May, 1928, and in a short note added to it by Mrs. Thackeray at the request of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation it is explained that Dr. Thackeray did not live to see the cover of this first fasciculus, and that it is hoped that other hands may bring his work to completion.

The Lexicon is intended to 'be of service alike to students of Judaism, of the New Testament and of Atticistic Greek. But . . . its main function is to elucidate the meaning of an important historian, with a very uneven style. This unevenness is attributable to the many hands which have gone to the making of his work, and an incidental object of this Lexicon is to attempt to determine the limits of the contributions of these several amanuenses.' The existence of these amanuenses can be proved for the *Jewish War* from the mouth of Josephus himself (χρησάμενός τισι πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα φωνὴν συνεργοῖς, *Ap.* i 50). Dr. Thackeray detects at least four varieties of style: (1) in the *Jewish War* he finds a number of words which do not occur elsewhere in Josephus, but he has not been able to discriminate the hands of the several assistants; he has, however, found that

'Book VII stands rather apart: here . . . the author seems to have been thrown more upon his own resources'; (2) in the *Antiquities*, Books XV-XVI, he finds 'the work of an able assistant, who has also lent occasional aid in revising the earlier books of the *Antiquities*, has translated edicts and official documents from Latin, and is probably identical with one of the *συνεργοί* employed in the *Jewish War* . . .'; (3) in *Antiquities* XVII-XIX 275 he finds the unmistakable work of a "Thucydidean" hack, distinguished by his free plagiarism from Thucydides and by certain mannerisms of his own, partly in imitation of the same model . . .'; (4) in *Antiquities* XIX 276 to the end, XX and *Vita* he finds a cruder style, resembling that of Book VII of the *Jewish War*, and thinks that 'here we probably come nearer than anywhere else to the *ipsissima verba* of the author.'

Words (or usages of words) in the Lexicon have prefixed to them one or other of four symbols when they are characteristic of one or other of these four styles, and a fifth symbol is prefixed to words (or to usages of words) for which it is not guaranteed that the references are exhaustive. Other symbols direct attention to words not elsewhere attested in Greek literature, to doubtful readings in the text, or to the fact that a word occurs in a rescript, decree, official document or letter, or is probably taken over from the author's source.

The Lexicon is composed in a commendably concise style. For the most

part we are given simply the word, its English equivalent, the reference, and enough of the Greek context to show how the word is used. When the Greek context is of no special interest it is omitted; when it presents special difficulty a hint is given for its translation. Here Dr. Thackeray has been successful in giving neither too much nor too little help, with the result that a very large amount of important information is packed into a small space.

The references attain a very high degree of accuracy. In respect of completeness also it seems probable both that the Lexicon falls little if at all short of the standard which Dr. Thackeray had set before himself as his aim, and that the standard aimed at is not lower than the highest that might in reason have been expected. The number of words intentionally

omitted or given with incomplete references seems to be very small indeed, and to consist entirely of words for which a longer list of references would have had little value. By some mischance the word *ἀναδρομή* does not occur in its alphabetical position, although it occurs in a passage (B. v. 58) which is correctly cited under *ἀμήχανος*. I have applied tests without finding any other omission which might be supposed unintentional.

By this work Dr. Thackeray has very greatly increased the debt which the world of scholarship already owed him, and every user of the Lexicon will feel grateful also to the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation for promoting the publication of such a monument of industry, learning, and acumen.

R. MCKENZIE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

THE LIFE OF CARACALLA.

Der historische Wert der Caracallavita.

By WILHELM REUSCH. Pp. 68.
Leipzig: Dieterich, 1931. Paper,
M. 4.50.

THIS short but sound and useful book, published as the twenty-fourth *Beiheft* to *Klio*, falls into three divisions. In the first the author reviews and examines the problem of the *S.H.A.* He sets forth the views of various German scholars from Dessau onwards, such as Heer, Kornemann, Schulz (of whose work he has but small opinion, though his conclusions as to the authentic sections of the *Life* differ but little from those of the earlier writer), Weber, Hönn, Hohl, Hasebroek and Domaszewski—with whose wild view that the *H.A.* was the work of a contemporary of Gregory of Tours he shows a certain sympathy. It is a pity that Herr Reusch has confined himself entirely to works emanating from his own country, dismissing *die ausländische Literatur* on the subject with the remark that it 'nirgends den Fortschritt nennenswert gefördert hat und auf die deutsche Forschung von Einfluss gewesen ist.' This is scarcely the language to apply to the publications of Tropea or to the recent

book of Mr. Norman Baynes, with its novel and, to many, convincing thesis. At the end of his introduction the author declines to enter into the question of the chronology of the Forger (or Forgers) or to declare his adherence to any particular view. 'Es ist nach wie vor,' he writes, 'die letzte Aufgabe aller Scriptoresforschung, die einzelnen Viten Satz für Satz auf ihre Echtheit zu untersuchen, um so zu einem geschlossenen Bild von dem historischen Wert einer jeden Vita zu gelangen.' This task Herr Reusch performs in his second chapter. The *Vita* is examined section by section, and its statements compared with those of Herodian, Dio, Eutropius and others. More than this: Herr Reusch has made, and used, an exhaustive study of the epigraphic and numismatic sources, and has produced the fullest materials for a complete history of the reign. Particularly admirable is his tracing, mainly from the evidence of coins, the exact route of Caracalla's advance through Asia Minor. Less convincing is his determination to see in any piece of verbal similarity a definite 'Fälschung.' Sentences such as: 'aus Eutrop stammt 9. 3; omni-

bus castris exosus: *Eutr.* 7. 23 (*Domitian universis exosus*), may well shake the most credulous into something like scepticism. Incidentally, Herr Reusch has never considered the possibility of a common source for the *Life* and the *Breviarium*. It is a little to be regretted that the author does not discuss the question whether the now generally accepted 'annalistic source' (Schulz and Kornemann's *Letzte Historiker*) ex-

tends over, or stops short of, the Caracalla biography. Most authorities agree that that work stops about this time, and it would be interesting to have Herr Reusch's opinion.

In his third and last chapter the author sums up his conclusions by reconstructing the 'genuine' *Vita*.

M. PLATNAUER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

FROM ANCIENT TO MEDIAEVAL.

Thought and Letters in Western Europe, 500 to 900 A.D. By M. L. W. LAISTNER, Professor of Ancient History in Cornell University. Pp. ix+354. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1931. 15s. net.

THE aim of this volume, as the author explains in his Preface, is to 'describe and estimate thought and literature in Western Europe during the four centuries following the final collapse of the Western Roman Empire.' The period 500-900 A.D. is the crucial period of the transition from the ancient to the mediaeval order, and Professor Laistner's book is a contribution to the story of the preservation of learning and civilisation against the forces which continually menaced them. He begins with a picture of Church and Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries, and explains how the Christians were compelled to accept, in spite of reservations, the scholastic system of the ancient world, and how a Christian literature arose, marked by original power and authority. Then he follows the course of letters from Boethius to Isidore. His estimate of the former is eminently fair and instructive. There are interesting pages on Gregory the Great and his contemporary Gregory of Tours, and a very good account of Spanish learning up to Isidore of Seville, whose influence on later thought is not neglected. The accomplishment of Irish and English scholars is estimated with great fairness. The account of Bede is particularly good, though (p. 125, note 3) it seems more likely (from *H.E.* iv. 2) that the English scholar got his knowledge of Greek from someone of the

school of Hadrian and Theodore than from Irish sources; and (p. 127) Bede's desire that copyists of his theological writings should not omit his *marginalia* was not always neglected, as Father Sutcliffe has shown. In dealing with that strange figure, Virgilius Maro the grammarian, Professor Laistner suggests that the most satisfactory explanation of his work is that 'it is a skit or parody on grammatical treatises.' It is really time that we ceased to take the author of the *Epitomae* with heavy seriousness. He is either a *mystificateur*, as Tardi has suggested, or a parodist, as Paul Lehmann and Professor Laistner are inclined to think. Professor Laistner's survey culminates in an admirable and detailed study of the Carolingian age, in which the chapters on 'Libraries and *Scriptoria*' and 'The Study of Greek' are remarkably good, and contain much information that has never been collected together before. In addition, the author gives an account not only of theological and political literature, but of the remains of the vernacular literature in poetry and prose. It is the completeness of the picture for which we have such reason to be grateful to Professor Laistner, as well as for the accuracy of the information given. I note that on p. 252 the *Glossa ordinaria* is ascribed to Walafrid Strabo, but there is no reason now to accuse him of its authorship (see *Revue Bénédictine*, 1928, p. 95). On pp. 243 and 258 the expression 'choir-bishop' is used. The *chorepiscopus* is a 'country-bishop,' and this is what the name implies.

F. J. E. RABY.

MEDIEVAL LATIN FOR SCHOOLS.

A Book of Medieval Latin for Schools.

By HELEN WADDELL. Pp. viii+86.
London: Constable, 1931. Cloth,
2s. 6d. net.

I REMEMBER saying, when I was reviewing Sedgwick's *Cena Trimalchionis* (C.R. XXXIX. 132), that I had always wanted to read (at least this part of) Petronius with an intelligent Sixth Form, and I rejoiced at the appearance of an edition which at last made it practicable. I think that the same credit may now be given to Miss Waddell: she has produced a little volume of extracts, cheap and decently printed, with a really full vocabulary, and so self-sufficient, which will be very valuable in ordinary school work. I am of the days of *Anglice Reddenda* (an admirable selection) and *Reddenda Minora*; and I know that I should have been very glad of an occasional change to entirely new matter of this sort.

Miss Waddell ranges very widely, in space and time: we have the miracles of Irish monks, extracts from the Vulgate, a few of the *Carmina Burana*, specimens of Sulpicius Severus, Fulbert, Walafrid Strabo, Alcuin, and a few hymns (not quite enough), the whole interspersed with some good pieces from the Vulgate: it was an excellent idea to give the *Te Deum*, which is a masterpiece both in English (Prayer Book version) and Latin. *Thine honourable, true, and only son* is perhaps better than its original; but when we come to *We believe that thou shalt come to be our judge* I cannot but prefer the simplicity, amounting to austerity, of *Judex crederis esse venturus*. (I wonder why Miss Waddell puts the date of Nicetas of Remesiana two centuries too late.)

I do wish however, full as I am of the praise of this little book, that Miss Waddell had held her hand and that of her friends in purifying the Latin of the extracts (let her consider the horrors of the hymns in the modern Roman Breviary, 'improved' in the sixteenth century from the originals). I want to be fair to her, and quote her own words: '... the texts have been revised. In the Middle Ages one could write happily

Dixit quod or *Dixit quia* for "He said that," instead of the accusative and infinitive; and Miss Broughall has pointed out and corrected many other less heinous things which authors did in the Middle Ages, and which we are taught, with great difficulty, not to do now.' This idea, that reading late Latin will spoil our style in composition (and there is no other reason for sparing the pupil's feelings), is all nonsense. In spite of the schoolmaster-bishops, our familiarity with the Greek Testament did not for a moment put us out of the way of writing Greek Prose in Thucydidean or Platonic style; and we used to sing hymns and graces in the broadest Italian pronunciation without ever being tempted to fall—as I still think it—from the purest English Latin in class work.

To take an example, the (to me) most touching story of the martyrdom of St. Thomas of Canterbury by William Fitzstephen: was it really necessary to change *ne vos moveatis* into *ne vos moveritis*, or *relictis et non percantatis vesperis* into *vesperis relictis*, or *cruorem defluum* into *cruorem defluentem*? Still more do I regret Miss Waddell's representing *Petrus Domino dicens 'Absit a te'* (Matt. xvi. 22), whereas Fitzstephen wrote *Petrus Domino dicens 'Propitius esto tibi,'* an exact representation of the Greek *Πρόσιος σοι, κύριε*, so showing that in his time an earlier version than the Vulgate was current in England.

But I would not end on a note of criticism. I should have given more notes but a shorter vocabulary: perhaps I meant my own *Anthology of Medieval Latin* (Macmillan, 1925) to serve to some extent the same purpose, and I still think that it might well follow Miss Waddell's book if the pupil wants more of this kind of Latin. I am sure that she has made a most useful start with these selections, and hope that the Classical Panel of the Assistant Mistresses' Association, to whose encouragement she pays due tribute, will see that they get a fair and wide trial: it is a hopeful experiment.

S. GASELEE.

A THEORY OF SYNTAX.

Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax, ein Versuch zur Erforschung der Bedingungen und Triebkräfte in Syntax und Stilistik. By W. HAVERS. Pp. xviii + 292. Heidelberg: Winter, 1931. Paper, 11 M.

THE reader may feel repelled by the sub-title of this book. He may think that it consists mainly of discourses on theoretical questions. But that is not so. The author has primarily in view the needs of students at German Universities who have learned Latin, Greek, French and English at school, and who are going on to a deeper study of one or more of those languages. In syntax they want to know, not merely what are the facts, but how they came to be; in other words, they want to explain them. The object of this sketch, as H. modestly calls it, is to give them practical guidance in the explanation of concrete examples.

We explain a syntactical phenomenon, he says, by showing what 'Bedingungen' made it possible, and what 'Triebkräfte' led the speaker to adopt it. (I will keep the words 'Bed.' and 'Tr.'—and H.'s convenient abbreviations—because the nearest English equivalents, 'Conditions' and 'Motives,' do not exactly correspond with them.) A few examples will make the author's meaning clear and at the same time show the quality of his book. P. 13: 'Wenn aus *quot anni* (sc. sunt) ein *quotannis* geworden ist, so ist diese Änderung bedingt durch die Existenz der Gruppe *his annis*.' (It would be better to show the student by an asterisk that we have no actual evidence that the Romans said **quot anni*, as the Greeks said *ὅσα ἔτη*, meaning 'annually.') H. completes the explanation of *quotannis* on p. 22, where he is discussing another 'Bed.': 'Mit Vorliebe schwindet die Pause bei häufig gebrauchten Parenthesen'; e.g. to explain the origin of *propediem*, 'so müssen wir ausgehen von einem ursprünglichen parenthetischen *prope dies* "nahe ist der Tag" mit der auch sonst in Parenthesen zu beobachtenden Ellipse der Kopula (vgl. *nu-dius tertius* "jetzt [ist seitdem] der dritte

Tag").' When the pause belonging to a parenthesis was dropped, *prope* was no longer felt as a predicate, and it seemed natural that it should be followed, as it generally was, by an accusative, although *prope diem* 'near the day' made no sense. H. continues: 'Dieses Beispiel zeigt zugleich, dass eine solche synt. Umdeutung ebenso wie eine Einordnung in das Satzganze unter anderem bedingt ist durch die Ellipse eines Ausdrucksmittels, d.h. hier durch die Ellipse der Kopula; genau so *quotannis*.'

The influence of the 'Tr.' on the form of expression is easier to trace, and H. treats them more briefly (47 pp.) than the 'Bed.' (133 pp.). Consider e.g. why Homeric heroes say *ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω, πειθόμεθα πάντες*, when they mean 'You must do what I propose,' and a schoolmaster says to a careless boy 'Was haben *wir* da wieder für eine Dummheit gemacht?' The motive which leads to the use of the first person plural instead of the second (sing. or pl.), which would express the meaning more exactly, is the same in both sentences. The speaker seeks to win the goodwill of his hearers by seeming to associate himself with them in his exhortation or expostulation.

The 'Bed.' are obviously of the most varied character. They are to be found, H. says, (1) in the language (as in the examples given above), (2) in the speaker, and (3) in his surroundings. A few of the headings will help to show how the subject is treated: under (2) we have e.g. 'die Volkslogik'; 'die Assoziative Denkweise'; 'Synt. Fehler und ihre psychischen Bed.'; under (3) e.g. 'Primitive geistige Kultur.'

H. does not exaggerate the importance of his attempt. 'Die vorgenommene Trennung in Bed. u. Tr.', he says, 'ist nur ein praktischer Notbehelf.' This 'Trennung' has its disadvantages. It gives sometimes the impression that things are simpler than they really are. It sometimes happens, as with *quotannis*, that an expression is explained by one factor in one paragraph and by another on a later page, though neither ex-

planation, taken by itself, is satisfactory. H. is well aware of this. He often warns his readers that nearly every syntactical phenomenon is the result of a number of 'Bed.' and 'Tr.', and he has an interesting chapter on 'Das Ineinandergreifen von Bed. u. Tr.'

There is, however, a certain advantage in concentrating the attention on one factor at a time and illustrating its effect in a number of languages. Much light has been thrown on Latin and Greek syntax in recent years by the comparative method, notably by Wackernagel in his masterly *Vorlesungen über Syntax* (Basel, Vol. I., 1920, 1925²; Vol. II., 1924). H. has a wide knowledge of the literature on the subject. He makes good use of it in his text, and in the sixty pages of Notes he shows the student where he may find a fuller discussion of any question.

H. writes easily and with great enthusiasm for his subject. But he is sometimes hasty. He does not always make his distinctions clear, and some of his examples are not well chosen. He says that *Nosti Marcellum quam tardus sit* is an instance of 'contamination' (i.e. a mixture of *Marcellum tardum esse* and *quam tardus Marcellus sit*), but that *Ne me indicetis qua platea aufugerim* is not. It is difficult to see any difference of construction; in both we have a principal clause, which makes complete sense by itself, followed by an 'erklärender Nachtrag,' viz. a dependent question the subject of which is understood from the object of the principal verb. Then H. contrasts contamination with anacoluthon and gives an excellent instance of the latter from Vopiscus: *Conferenti mihi . . . intellego*. Here, as he says, there is no

mixing; two lines separate the verb from the participle; the writer has simply forgotten that he began with the dative and had meant to say *videtur*. H. continues: 'Dagegen sind viele Fälle des sog. Nom. abs., namentlich in kürzeren Sätzen wie Pl. *Apol.* 21 C: *διαλεγόμενος αὐτῷ ἔδοξε μοι, zweifellos durch eine Verschmelzung von Parallelkonstruktionen zustande gekommen.*' (My italics.) The example is not well chosen; for (1) the words quoted cannot be described as a comparatively short sentence; they form part of a sentence some five lines long. (2) Many editors put a dash or a comma after *αὐτῷ*, i.e. they think that Socrates makes a pause at that point, and then goes on, as extempore speakers often do, with an expression which does not quite fit on to what he has just said. If we read a page or two of the context, we see that this interpretation is very probable, if not 'zweifellos.' Now if there is a pause, there is no contamination; for that occurs, as H. says, when two constructions come into the mind at the same time and are combined in a new construction, e.g. *Soph. Tr.* 1238, *ἀνὴρ ὃς ὥς ἔοικεν οὐ νεμεῖν ἐμοί . . . μοῖραν* (a mixture of *ὥς ἔοικεν, οὐ νεμεῖ* with *οὐ νεμεῖν ἔοικεν*); *Ter. Ad.* 648, *Vt opinor eas non nosse te*.

However, the book is very readable and interesting, especially because of the frequent comparison of ancient and modern languages. One may even learn a little English. Not every one has heard 'She is both their mothers' where the strange plural is due to 'both.' Cp. Wackernagel, *Vorl. I.* 51 f.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

London.

THE BALKAN LANGUAGES.

Linguistique balkanique, problèmes et résultats. Par KR. SANFELD. Pp. 242. (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris. XXXI.) Paris: Champion, 1930. Paper.

THIS book is a careful and scholarly study of the remarkable points of

resemblance to be found in the languages spoken in the Balkan peninsula: Greek, Albanian, Roumanian in its several varieties, Bulgarian, and to a less degree other Slav tongues. The general loss of the infinitive over most of this area, and the odd fact that in Albanian, and in Roumanian and in Bulgarian, alone

among Romance and Slav languages, the definite article follows the noun, are fairly generally known, but the author shows that the resemblances in these languages go very far beyond these points. The book falls naturally into two parts: a discussion of the loan-words and (Chs. III. and IV.) *Concordances en dehors du lexique*. This non-lexical part is difficult to criticise for a man who can claim a knowledge of only one of the languages concerned, but in general Mr. Sandfeld seems to be both learned and judicious. He is well aware that any profitable discussion of the origin of words found in more than one language, and of the date when a word passed from one language into another, demands a knowledge of the phonetic history of all the languages concerned. He recognises also that many individual points can never be solved, owing to our ignorance of the historical movements of some of these peoples and also to our lack of early linguistic documents. Of theories involving the influence of some now lost linguistic substratum he is properly extremely shy. There are, however, certain words found in all these languages, except in Turkish, the origin of which is entirely obscure. These 'mots balkaniques,' he thinks it plausible to suppose, 'on est bien tenté de croire,' come from some now dead language, preferably Thracian. Here I may note that the existence of *κοπέλι*, *bastard*, hence *child* in general, in modern Pontic Greek makes it hardly possible for this to be one of these 'Balkan words,' as is said on p. 93. It is found in mediaeval Greek and must have passed thence into the other Balkan languages. He also gives the evidence for the 'protobulgar' words in Bulgarian, words coming from the period when the Bulgarian talked, not a Slav language, but something of Turanian affinities. But our author lays little stress on these unprovable possibilities and *faute de mieux* explanations: his general conclusion is that all these resemblances between the present Balkan languages are due to geographical contacts at some time or another, and to the existence of numerous bilingual individuals. The preponderance of Greek influence

is recognised and ascribed to the cultural position of Byzantium and the activities of the Greek Church. Turkish, probably owing to its extremely alien structure, lies outside this community of languages; its influence has hardly gone beyond the numerous loan-words which the Turks have imposed upon the subject peoples. Space is lacking for me to notice details. On p. 125 I note that the first syllable of the Lesbian form *kal'tsevgu*, to ride, the common Greek *καβαλλικεύω*, has no connexion at all with the Albanian *kal* and the Roumanian *cal* from *caballus*, but must be grouped with the numerous forms from the Greek islands which arise from the dropping of intervocalic β: the two alphas then coalesce. In the treatment of Bulgarian I find no mention of certain books which describe dialects of the language riddled to an extraordinary degree with Greek words. One of these, spoken near Philippopolis, was described by Skordelis in 1874, and his work has been discussed by Gustav Meyer in *Neugr. Studien*, II., p. 90. On another we have two books by K. I. Tsioulkas called *Συμβολαὶ εἰς τὴν διγλωσσίαν τῶν Μακεδόνων*. Both have the same title and the same date, 1907; the subject of both is the same, but the matter entirely different. Tsioulkas has, in fact, provided a bibliographical puzzle of the first water. That both Skordelis and Tsioulkas consider the language a dialect of Greek is due to their patriotism. Its Bulgarian character is shown clearly by the fact that its endings are in no case Greek; the words are Greek with Bulgarian endings. It is much to be regretted that neither author has given us continuous texts. It would be very interesting in this connexion if we could have from a competent scholar like our author some study of the mixed, but more Slav than Greek, dialect now spoken at Florina and in the neighbourhood, and called locally *Μακεδονικά*. I must not leave Sandfeld's book without remarking that what he has to say on phrases in one language modelled, *calquées*, on those in another is of a linguistic interest which goes very far beyond the limits of the Balkans. A warm welcome should be given to this

valuable book, which exhibits a knowledge of languages beyond the reach of all but a very few scholars. The index, in several ways excellent, does not, but

should, contain all the loan-words discussed in the text.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Exeter College, Oxford.

SOME CLASS-BOOKS.

Foundations for Latin Prose Composition.

By L. W. P. LEWIS, M.A., and E. H. GODDARD, M.A. Pp. xii+166. Heinemann, 1931. Cloth, 3s.

THIS book deserves respect, for it is the result of long experience, and all criticism is met by the claim that 'it works.' There is an excellent selection of prose passages and miscellaneous exercises, and the rules are expressed with welcome clarity and conciseness. The hints are valuable, though more might be left to the teacher, and there are good grammar papers. It is the earlier part that invites criticism. There are too few exercises, only two for conditions, and one for all the uses of gerunds and gerundives. The unusual grouping is a doubtful improvement. Uses of *qui*, *quo*, *quominus*, and *quin* follow in breathless haste on final clauses. And when shall we have a book which regularly begins with some simple examples like 'I did this in order to be praised,' instead of confusing the issue by sentences like 'In order not to be blamed, I pretended not to have heard you'?

All this, however, is armchair criticism; the book needs to be tried, and it is full of hints and notes which betray a practical knowledge of the curious pitfalls which school-children dig for themselves.

The Revised Latin Primer. By B. H.

KENNEDY, D.D. Revised by J. F. MOUNTFORD, M.A., D.Litt. Pp. viii+248. Longmans, 1931. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

A NEW edition of this indispensable book will be pure gain in the end, in spite of the immediate problem of the form whose members possess the old, the new, and the abridged Primer. Care has been taken to make the inconvenience as small as possible, and it will be a relief when we are finally free from such forms as *duis* and *tristiori* as an alternative ablative. Another improvement is the subdivision of the list of

principal parts. The sections might perhaps have been smaller still; and it is a pity that the gender rhymes have not been rewritten to avoid the rhyming of *-es* and *aes* with *increase*—at least, we do not lose our annual joke. Finally, could not something be done to show the relative importance of *ama* and *amato*?

The Clarendon Latin Course. By ARTHUR CLENDON, M.A., and J. H. VINCE, M.A. Pp. 288. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931. Cloth, 4s.

THERE is need of a book which will cover the ground up to about matriculation standard in four years, and this book claims to give all that is needed for the first two years. The vocabulary is wider than usual; early on we meet with 'foxes' teeth.' If more of the explaining had been left to the teacher, there would have been room for such things as further exercises on the relative—a construction which is found surprisingly difficult—and for more translation in the first year. In general too much is taken in the second year and too little in the first. The translation passages, especially the account of Roman history, are excellently done.

Selected Letters of Cicero. By H. M. POTEAT, Ph.D. Revised. Pp. xv+276. Heath, 1931. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

THE author has made a good selection, and his notes succeed in being vivid and striking, and give much help to the reader who has not the knowledge to translate nor the humour to enjoy Cicero. He is determined not to be dry, but is it arid pedagogy to object to 'C. Antonius nosed out Catiline'? In his desire to escape from the 'Grandeur that was Rome,' he seems to have given us Mark Twain's 'Killing of Julius Caesar "localised."'

Lower Latin Sentences. By J. J. ROBERTSON, M.A., B.D. (Lond.). Pp. 31. Blackie, 1931. Paper, 6d.

THIS is a useful book; its aim is modest—to provide revision sentences for students of about School Certificate standard, who have gone once through the ordinary rules of syntax. There are four hundred good sentences, including all the catches, and the book is cheap and light.

Memoranda Latina. By M. KEAN, M.A. Pp. vi+138. Blackie, 1931. Stiff paper, 1s.

NO doubt the 195 sections of this little book could be memorised with great profit for examination purposes, but what a dead, mechanical thing it would make of the subject. Vocabulary is of great importance, but let the students fill their own word-books with phrases they have met in the living language, and when they learn by heart, learn passages of Roman writers.

Iohannis Historia, ad tironum delectationem conscripta. By W. B. SEDGWICK, A.M. Pp. vi+40. Bell, 1931. Limp cloth, 9d.

PLATO would not have approved of this book for the very young, and it is doubtful if the very young themselves will approve. It does not lead the soul towards the beautiful, and the wit is adult.

A List of Books in the English Language on Ancient History for the Use of Teachers in Schools. By NORMAN H. BAYNES, F.B.A. (Published for the Historical Association.) Pp. 16. Bell, 1931. Paper.

THIS pamphlet gives a list of the most important books on Jewish, Greek, and Roman history, with brief but enlightening comments to show their nature. It is a most useful book of reference, but it is interesting to speculate on the mind of a child who had been fed on the cream of all the works it mentions.

D. H. GRAY.

St. Leonards, St. Andrews.

Papyri graecae magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri. II. Von KARL PREISENDANZ, unter Mitarbeit von ERICH DIEHL, SAM EITREM, ADOLF JACOBY. Pp. xv+216; 20 photogravures on 3 folding plates. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1931. Rm. 20 (unbound, 18).

THE second volume of Preisendanz' valuable collection (see C.R. XLIII, p. 74) 'bringt,' says the editor-in-chief, 'den Rest der griechischen Zauberdokumente auf Papyrus, zusammen mit einigen verwandten Stücken auf Pergament, Ton und Holz.' It contains fifty-four pieces of the first category (VII-LX), together with twenty similar, but for the most part shorter, documents of Christian origin, five ostraka and four wooden tablets. Of the papyri proper, four (Nos. VII, XII, XIII, and XXXVI) are long and important; they are respectively Brit. Mus. Pap. Gr. CXXI, Gr. P. J 384 of the Ryksmuseum van Oudheden at Leiden, J 395 (formerly Anastasi 76) of the same collection, and Pap. I Oslo (first published in *Papyri Osloenses I*, in 1925). The shorter pieces include, among other very welcome things, the cryptogram-papyrus (No. LVII) first deciphered by Hunt and published by him in Proc. Brit. Acad. for June 19, 1929. A few unpublished documents known to the editors had perforce to be omitted, as they have not yet been officially given to the public and are being prepared by other hands; some of these are to appear (see p. 188) in the last volume of this series.

The general format is but little altered although a few modifications have had to be made in the interests of economy, both in money and space. The notes are still shorter than in the first volume, but contrive to squeeze in a great amount of useful information. The translation now stands under the text instead of opposite it. A short palaeographical index is inserted to save numerous mentions of expanded contractions and other such things. The good sense of the editors has contrived to leave the book fully usable by any reader of tolerable intelligence, despite these limitations.

With so good a collection available, there is abundant material for the student. A few trifling points of disagreement which the reviewer notices are the following. In XIX (=P. gr. 9909 of the Berlin Museum), line 51, σκότωσον is rendered 'umfinstere.' May it not mean 'kill,' as in modern Greek, of which the language of these papyri contains not a few anticipations (as in No. XXXVI, 196, κατέχω μὲ τὴν δεξιάν, 'I hold in my right hand')? In No. XX, 20 (=Amherst Papyri II, 2), φείγουσιν δὲ μόνυχες ἴπποι will scan well enough, in the pronunciation of that time, as the end of a hexameter, and the reading φείγουσι is unnecessary. In No. XXXVI, 323, I am inclined to see in ὁδοῖς a vulgar equivalent of ὁδοῖ, and take it as agreeing with the subject of βρεξάρω; the translation seems to omit the word; while in the preceding line I would take ἵνα μίνης ἀσύνλημπτος as a substantial clause, object of βούλει, 'you wish to re-

main incapable of conception.' An admittedly difficult phrase is ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ σχολῶν ἔχων, XIII, 284. 'Der im Himmel seine Zeit verbringt' is Preisendanz' rendering, Jacoby (see p. 216) thinks of the Jewish idea of God studying the Torah in heaven. I venture to suggest that σχολῶν here means something like 'post' in the military sense, being akin to the late Latin use of *schola*. H. J. ROSE.

Die Zahlenmystik bei Philon von Alexandria.
By KARL STAEBLE. Pp. vi+92. Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1931. Paper, Rm. 5 (bound, 7).

AMONG the lost works of Philon of Alexandria, otherwise Philo Iudaeus, was a treatise *περί ἀριθμῶν*, which undoubtedly, if it had survived, would be of considerable interest and value for the study of the neo-Pythagorean doctrine of numbers. Its contents can, however, be to a great extent reconstructed by putting together his actual references to it in other works, and adding the various passages in which he discusses the mystical significance of numbers. This Staehle has done, and added thereto a large selection of passages from other authors, such as Nikomachos and Macrobius, who treat of the same subject and are connected with Philon by identity of source, dependence upon his writings, or at least by similarity of views. The greater part of this essay, which is a doctoral thesis presented at Tübingen in 1929, therefore consists of extracts arranged under convenient heads (*περί τῆς μονάδος*, p. 19 . . . *περί τῆς δεκάδος*, p. 53; then 'sonstige Zahlen,' pp. 58-75). There follow a few notes on the interpretation of certain passages, and the whole is preceded by a short introduction on arithmology.

The author is obviously diligent, and as obviously young. Hence there is a certain cocksure crudity in the views he expresses, which will no doubt amend itself later. He might, for example, learn not to cite the *Timaeus* or avail himself of F. Müller's arguments in favour of Philippos of Opus as the author of the *Epinomis*, without remembering that A. E. Taylor has edited the one and refuted the other. At present he seems to know only German and a little American and French work on ancient philosophy. And before he talks of Greek music again, he might learn something about it. H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Hippocrates, vol. iv., and *Heracleitus* 'On the Universe.' With an English translation by W. H. S. JONES, Litt.D. Pp. lx+520. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1931. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.)

WITH the publication of the fourth volume the Loeb selection from the Hippocratic writings is completed. By including in this volume π. φύσις ἀνθρώπου, π. διαίτης ὑγιεινῆς, π. χυμῶν, ἀφορισμοί, and π. διαίτης i-iv, Dr. Jones provides a sample of the varied material to be found in the Hippocratic collection. Of all these perhaps the most interesting is the first book of the π. διαίτης, which exhibits on a large scale the

obscurity already exemplified in previous volumes, in treatises like π. εὐχρησμένης and π. τροφῆς. For the benefit of the general student, it is all to the good that such works should be published in this way; it helps him to appreciate some of the difficulties which confront specialists in ancient science and philosophy. But it lays a heavy task upon the editor—a task which Dr. Jones has nobly undertaken and accomplished; and the introductions which he provides in the present volume are from this point of view of special value. Obscurity is not, however, the only difficulty which the editor and translator has to contend with; there is also the state of the manuscript tradition, which makes the construction of a text an extremely tortuous and bewildering business. Of a good proportion of the matter here printed there has been no continuous text produced since Littré; and it is therefore very gratifying that Dr. Jones has collated all the chief manuscripts of the treatises which he has here edited, and has given the more important readings in the *apparatus*.

With reference to the π. διαίτης, Dr. Jones rightly insists (as Heidel did), contrary to the fashion in vogue in Friedrich's time, that the author is not a mere patchwork journeyman, but one who saw his subject as a whole, and treated it as such. There has been a tendency in the past to facile and categorical assertion that this passage is taken straight from one philosopher, that from another; but closer investigation indicates that the problems and questions which arise are not to be answered so simply; and that in order to answer them it is necessary to be fairly certain what is the sense of the doctrines which we think are being borrowed. It would have been interesting to hear more about this treatise, but a full discussion of it would have to go far beyond the limit which the series sets.

The volume closes, appropriately enough, with the fragments of Heracleitus, arranged after Bywater. This is the first time that any of the pre-Socratics has made his appearance in the Loeb series.

An index to all four volumes is provided.

A. L. PECK.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

The Mediaeval Latin Versions of the Aristotelian Scientific Corpus, with Special Reference to the Biological Works. By S. D. WINGATE. Pp. viii+136. London: Courier Press, 1931. 10s. 6d. net.

MISS WINGATE'S work is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the mediaeval versions of Aristotle. So far as concerns the works of Aristotle other than the scientific, she has taken full account of the work of the Jourdain, Birkenmaier, Grabmann, Pelster, Pelzer, and other scholars. With regard to the scientific, and more particularly the biological writings, she has not only done this, but much besides, which makes her account the fullest and best extant. She has visited thirty-eight libraries in Spain and Portugal, and twenty-seven in Italy, in addition to many in England and France,

and her work has profited much from her first-hand examination of manuscripts. The book begins with a chapter of preliminary considerations, dealing with the works of Aristotle which the Latins possessed before the great period of the mediaeval versions, and with the Aristotelian tradition among the Arabs and at Byzantium. From this the author passes to a general account of the beginnings of the revival of Aristotelian study in the West, and then to detailed chapters on the twelfth and thirteenth century versions of Aristotle, the biological works being treated with great fullness and thoroughness. Next follows a discussion of Roger Bacon's rather wild and ungenerous remarks on the thirteenth-century translators, and a summary account of the versions of Arabian and Greek commentators on Aristotle, and of Renaissance versions of Aristotle's works. There is a useful Index of Works at the beginning, and an Index of Authors at the end.

The work, which is a D.Phil. thesis of London University, owes much to the inspiration of Dr. Charles Singer. It is a work of real learning, and one for which all students of the transmission of the Aristotelian tradition will be grateful.

W. D. ROSS.

Oriel College, Oxford.

Rhetores Graeci, vol. XIV., *Prolegomenon Sylloge*. Edited H. RABE. Pp. cxxviii + 494. Teubner, 1931. Sewn, M. 20; bound, M. 22.

THE *Prolegomena* contained in this collection are of two kinds: general introductions to the Art of Rhetoric, and introductions to particular works of Aphthonius and Hermogenes. The former usually base themselves on Aristotle's four questions, *τὸ τί, τὸ διότι, εἰ ἔστιν, τί ἔστιν*; though occasionally the fourth question is omitted or a fifth, *τί σημαίνει τοῦτομα*, added. Then there are introductions divided into ten headings, *εἰ ἐκ θεοῦ ἡ ῥητορικὴ, εἰ ἐν θεοῖς, εἰ ἐν ἡρώσιν, πῶς εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἦλθεν ἡ ῥητορικὴ*, and so forth. (The first of these questions is easily answered, by a syllogism which gives an idea of the mental level attained by some of these writers: *Εἰ ἐκ θεοῦ πᾶν ἀγαθόν, ἐκ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ ῥητορικὴ· ἀγαθὸν γὰρ οὐσα ἐκ θεοῦ ἔστιν.*) Others, again, analyse philosophically the terms *λόγος, ῥήτωρ, ῥητορικὴ*, or enquire whether rhetoric is an art, a science, or a knack.

These Introductions are, for the most part, a dreary waste of pedantry and triviality, where one laments alternately that Aristotle, or Isocrates, was ever born. No. 32 (Joannes Siculus's introduction to Hermogenes, *π. ιδεῶν*) is a museum piece, illustrating the extremity of tortuousness, affectation and obscurity of which Greek is capable. No. 9 (Doxapater, to Aphthonius' *Progyrnasmata*) is not far behind it. No. 16 is another elaborate production, with its *parisoseis* and *homoeoteleuta* oddly combined with a curiously naive affection for *πᾶν ὀνόμα*. But an occasional oasis consoles the reader. Phoebammon's introduction to the *π. ιδεῶν* of Hermogenes (No. 28) contains a not uninteresting discussion of the possibility and advisability of literary imitation. In No. 4 there is

a quaint description of the *τρόποι ῥητορικῶν ἀναγνώσεων*. There are, as one might expect, three: the first is *σύντομος, τῆς πληγῆς τοῦ πνεύματος θάπτον κατὰ τὴν τραχείαν ἀρτηρίαν καθάπερ πληκτρὸν κτυπούσης, ὥστε προηγῆσθαι τῆς φωνῆς τὴν ἀρτηρίαν*: the second is *ἀνεμίνος*, the third μέσος.

As far as a layman in these highly specialised studies can guess, Dr. Rabe has done his work with the monumental thoroughness which one would expect from him. The extensive preface deals fully with the text, with the evolution of the various forms of introduction, and with other matters. Probably the part of the book most valuable to the general student is the *Index Verborum*, which enables one to trace through later Greek many important technical terms of criticism.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

Excavations at Olynthus, Part III.: The Coins found at Olynthus in 1928. By DAVID M. ROBINSON. Pp. xiv + 129; 29 collotype plates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford, 1931. £2 5s.

THIS very careful and detailed publication of all the coins found in the course of the first excavations at Olynthus is naturally of more especial interest to numismatists. The work is well done and profusely illustrated, though the quality of the plates is poor and the text might have been shortened in places to advantage. As a result we obtain a lively picture of the commercial relationships of Olynthus. The most important fact that emerges is that practically no coins were found of a later date than the capture of the city, which strongly supports the author's view that the site was never again reoccupied. This should give a useful terminus for the chronology of other objects the dating of which is not so certain.

E. S. G. ROBINSON.

British Museum.

The Cretan Koinon. By MAURICE VAN DER MIJNSBRUGGE. Pp. 86. New York: Stechert, 1931. Paper, \$1.15.

THIS book collects what little is known about the unstable League of the Cretan cities; it gives a good historical sketch, and has a useful list of the inscriptions and a bibliography. The author however seeks primarily to prove that the Cretan *κοινὸδικιον*, long believed by most scholars to have been a *tribunal*, was a *contract*, 'the contract by which the Cretan states accept the diagramma or code of the Cretan Union'; and I fear that his intricate argument has two basic flaws. As *κοινὸδικιον* in Polybius XXII, 15, 4 probably refers to acceptance of the general laws of the League, the author treats the word as identical with *κοινὸδικιον* (which Büttner-Wobst unfortunately prints in Polybius) and uses it to interpret *S.G.D.I.* 5040; but there seems no doubt that the view is right which treats the two words as different things. Then, as regards the inscriptions, he bases his argument (pp. 35-51) solely on *S.G.D.I.* 5040, and entirely omits to consider *I.G.* XII. 3, 254

though he has printed it twice (pp. 17, 29); but this inscription is conclusive against him unless he can find some better restoration of ll. 24-5 than that adopted in *I.G.*; for if [δίκαν ἐν κοινωδικίῳ ἀπρ[όδικον] be correct, the word can only mean a court of law. Apart from this, I cannot believe that *S.G.D.I.* 5040, l. 28, ἀφ' ᾧ τὸ κοινωδικίον ἀπέλιπε χρόνῳ, can mean, as his theory demands, 'from the time when our contracts (two of them) with the Koinon came to an end.' This part of the author's purpose therefore, I think, does not succeed, though his view that the Cretan League was based upon arbitration may, of course, still be correct. He is probably right too in holding, as against Muttelsee, that there was no federal citizenship in the Cretan League, and he correctly interprets the League's grant of πολιτεία in *I. Magnesia* 20; he might have supported this by noticing that the Thessalian and Island Leagues similarly granted citizenship in their constituent cities. As to *I. Magnesia* 20 itself, it is not, I think, a 'fictitious' decree, as he calls it, but a genuine decree doctored; if the clause ἐδοξεν δὲ πῶν αὐτῶν ἐς τὰν Ἀσίαν ἀποικίαν στειλάσθαι be omitted, it is simply a common-form decree of the Cretan League; these words, which break both the sense and the grammar, were presumably inserted as a parenthesis by the Magnesians themselves when they set it up.

W. W. TARN.

Das Ptolemäergeld: Eine Entwicklungsgeschichte des ägyptischen Münzwesens unter Berücksichtigung der Verhältnisse von Kyrene. By DR. WALTHER GIESECKE. Pp. iv+98; 4 collotype plates. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1930. Price 12 marks (unbound, 10).

DR. GIESECKE'S study of the coinages of Italy down to the beginning of the Republic has led him into a still more treacherous field. The problem before the student of Ptolemaic currency is how to reconcile the fluctuating relative values of the various units in which sums of money are expressed in papyri and ostraka with each other and with the coins themselves. The answer depends upon the degree to which one believes that bi- or trimetallism was consistently practised, and upon the relative values each to each of the three metals used in coinage. Now while we know with some accuracy the ratio of gold to silver for the period, widely divergent views are taken of the ratio of the precious metals to copper. No fully satisfactory system of Egyptian currency has yet been produced: nor in the present state of our knowledge does it seem possible to do so, for the uncertain factors are too many. The most noteworthy attempt is that of the late T. Reinach (*Rev. des études grecques*, 1928, pp. 121 ff.). Giesecke, who appears to be unacquainted with Reinach's work, assumes the Egyptian currency to have been trimetallic down to the time of Cleopatra (when the copper coins would have ceased to be worth their weight in metal) and the ratio of copper to silver to have been 1 in 100-120. On these assumptions he traces a progressive

diminution of the unit of account introduced by the first Ptolemy to a sixteenth part of its original value, the sign, in fact, of a series of public bankruptcies. The coins themselves do not share in this depreciation, but would have been tariffed higher and higher in terms of the unit of account. Given all his assumptions a certain case can be made out for his view, but it can only be considered as highly speculative.

Several points of detail are open to criticism; thus we know quite definitely on papyrological evidence that the ratio of gold to silver was nearer 13 : 1 than 8 or 10 : 1 in the middle of the third century, and to suggest that Ptolemy copied his early monetary system from Cyrene is to put the cart before the horse. Indeed the whole treatment of the Cyrenaic currency (which, incidentally, though interesting enough in itself, has little bearing on the main question under discussion) leaves something to be desired.

E. S. G. ROBINSON.

British Museum.

Bilder Griechischer Vasen: Der Berliner Maler. By J. D. BEAZLEY. Pp. 22; pl. 32. Berlin: Heinrich Keller, 1930.

THE books in this series are now four in number. Two of the four deal with late classes of Attic red-figure; the remaining two, by Professor Beazley, with outstanding painters of the archaic period.

The Berlin Painter is the first of these, as he deserves. His work is, of course, familiar to us from Beazley's articles in the *J.H.S.*, from sections in *Vases in America* and *Attische Vasenmaler*, and from other writings by the same author; but there is no doubt that an artist so gifted and so influential requires the fuller treatment which a monograph like the present alone can give. The reader, on his side, gains the feeling of enjoying the vases at leisure, the certainty of seeing points which he would have missed if left to himself, and the pleasure of reading prose which, even when translated, is singularly attractive.

The Berlin Painter's career may be summarised as follows: he started work a little before 500 B.C. as the pupil of Phintias and Euthymides, and must have made his mark early, for the works of his first period include the magnificent amphora from which he gets his name as well as the vases which we associate with him most readily. He might lay claim to have invented the Nolan amphora and to have adopted the bell-crater into the potters' repertory. His second period was characterised by pieces which are fine indeed, but less fresh and less distinguished than those of his first; in his third period he was ill at ease among the new ideals of a younger generation, and he ceased to work about 460. Among his pupils, direct or indirect, are the Providence Painter, Hermonax, and, finally, the Achilles Painter, who is thus provided with a pedigree as far as Euthymides. There were, however, other pupils with less personality whose 'school pieces' are almost impossible to distinguish from the more mechanical drawings by the master's own hand.

Besides the account of our artist's style and

development, this book contains a catalogue of his works more complete than that in *Attische Vasenmalerei*, for it increases the number of vases to 206, it enlarges the descriptions by telling us what is late and what early, and it sometimes enriches them by a line or two of commentary. But the greatest service which the editors have rendered both to the artist and to his admirers is the collection of plates. It is a luxury to have so much material between the same covers, instead of the usual apparatus of books and photographs, some of which are hard to procure. We need have recourse to them only if we are curious to know what happened in the Berlin Painter's second and third periods, for both photographs and drawings concentrate on the earlier, finer and more characteristic pieces. The clarity of the reproductions cannot be too highly praised, but the most appealing are undoubtedly those where the figures are not disassociated from the vases. I have often wondered why views of 'the total vase, compound of shape and decoration' are so rare. If the Berlin Painter popularised the bell-crater, we ought to see one of the examples he produced. After looking through the illustrations, one is glad of the reassurance (p. 10) that 'Gefäßform und Zeichnung gehen Hand in Hand.'

WINIFRED LAMB.

The Book of Diogenes Laertius; Its Spirit and Its Method. By RICHARD HOPE. Pp. xiv + 242. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1930. Cloth, 17s. 6d.

THE main conclusions of this painstaking, if somewhat mechanical, piece of research are that 'as a source book of biographical and doxographical items concerning the classic philosophers of Greece, the compilation of Diogenes Laertius cannot, in view of his methods, be regarded with much seriousness' (p. 208), and that 'the chief value of the compilation lay in the service which it rendered to its first readers as a primer of instruction or as a moral handbook and a manual of social charm' (p. 217). The first of these conclusions is to Mr. Hope one of great moment, for according to him it means that 'an authentic history of Greek philosophy cannot be written' (p. 208). That is because for him Diogenes' work forms 'the basis of modern histories of Greek philosophy down to the present time' (p. 32). There is surely much exaggeration in that. Diogenes has long ceased to stand high with serious historians of Greek philosophy, and if Mr. Hope has succeeded in lowering his credit still further, there still remain the works of Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Plotinus, etc., etc., to say nothing of the remains of fairly reputable doxographers like Aetius, on which to build an authentic, if incomplete, history of Greek philosophy. That Mr. Hope has succeeded in adding to the discredit of Diogenes is, I think, the case; and in that and in his proof of the precariousness of all attempts to determine and reconstruct Diogenes' chief sources I should be inclined to place the chief value of his book.

Mr. Hope writes a very cumbrous and ugly English, and his pages are disfigured by several unsightly mistakes and misprints; e.g. *John Scaliger* (p. 2), *minuscles* (p. 18), *Cobet's Collectaneae Criticae* (p. 28), *diadoxoi* (p. 48), *Derkyllides* (p. 51), *ἰθύνει* (p. 67), *Plato's Euthydemus* (p. 75 and 95, but *Euthydemus*, p. 84), *ἐναυνοῦσθαι* (p. 121), *Elenchtheists* (p. 135), *Massegetae* (p. 150), *περὶ τῶν λόγων τεθρῆναι* (p. 194).

A long bibliography concludes the work. It contains an article by Mr. J. St. Loe Strachey on 'Shirtsleeve Portraits of Greek Philosophers' in the *New York Times* of April 4, 1926, but omits Professor P. Shorey's 'Note on Diogenes Laertius ix. 108' in *Classical Philology*, 1916, p. 465, and 1918, pp. 412 ff.

W. L. LORIMER.

St. Andrews.

Greek Coinage. By J. G. MILNE. Pp. viii + 131; 12 half-tone plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931. 6s.

THIS book is neither a handbook of numismatics, nor an art-manual, nor a coin-commentary upon history: sharing somewhat the nature of all three, it introduces university students and others to the economic and political significance of Greek coinage. The opening chapters, dealing with the origin and spread of money, have at the present time a more than academic interest: they emphasise Aristotle's definition of metal currency and the manner in which the Greeks maintained their monetary standards.

These chapters, dealing much with hypothesis and conjecture, call for more comment than the rest of the book. Reference might have been made to the bronze 'oxhides' of the late Bronze Age, which, bearing stamped symbols, are almost 'money.' Woodward (*Artemis Orthia*, p. 391) has added to our knowledge of iron spit-money. While Siphnos is the almost certain source of Aegina's silver in the seventh century, the theory, however tempting, of Illyria as the source of Corinth's at that date is too little supported to justify a downright statement of fact. Again, for the wholesale restriking of one city's coins by another there is sometimes adequate numismatic evidence (e.g. Cyrene); but the statement that it is 'evident' that the Solonian staters were restruck on Corinthian staters, because their weight is the same, strains the laws of evidence; other explanations suggest themselves, and without numismatic evidence of restriking we cannot accept the theory. Indeed, Mr. Milne himself does not accept it whole-heartedly; presently (p. 42) he qualifies it with an 'apparently,' and on p. 49 he refers to it in ambiguous terms.

Towards the problem of early Attic coinage Mr. Milne's attitude is conservative: Seltman's work is ignored, both in the appropriate chapter and in the bibliography. The latter is brief, even if for its purpose adequate; but those who wish for a cautious presentation of the present state of the problem of early Attic issues may well be referred to the *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. IV. (G. F. Hill: Adcock). Mr. Milne nowhere mentions the study of die-

sequences; the general reader deserves to be informed of this development, which has a more than technical importance.

Such criticisms apart, this book fills a definite need, is well written and interesting, and has excellent plates. W. L. CUTTLE.

Downing College, Cambridge.

Cicero and the Theater. By F. WARREN WRIGHT. (Smith College Classical Studies, No. 11.) Pp. xii + 112. Northampton, Massachusetts, 1931. 75 cents.

THIS book collects all the information Cicero gives on things dramatic. After a chapter describing the festivals and exhibitions where plays were possible, and the political feeling that might show itself on such occasions, the author states what is known of Aesopus, Roscius, and the other actors who appear in Cicero's works; the social prejudice against actors is illustrated; theatrical gesture, voice-production and music are touched upon. In the next two chapters are collected the allusions to plays and playwrights, both Latin and Greek. The book ends by showing the ample store of theatrical terms on which Cicero drew for his similes and metaphors.

The vast bulk of the material is apt to become wearisome, but it serves to show how completely Cicero was steeped in the drama, and what varied occasions justified a dramatic allusion or quotation. The plays might be used to illustrate a problem in moral philosophy, the character or situation of Cicero's client, opponent, or subject of correspondence, a coined word, archaic form, alliteration, or other figure of speech. The author renders a valuable service by indicating what dramas were still being performed in Cicero's day; some performances are indeed proved by definite statements in his *Letters* and elsewhere; but many plays are shown by various arguments to be probably on the repertoire—e.g. plays mentioned in the *Orations* must have been recent productions; otherwise the allusions would have impressed very few of Cicero's hearers. Ennius, Accius, Pacuvius, and Terence were thus the Big Four of the Ciceronian stage; but Caecilius and Plautus stand between them and those who 'also ran.' The author concisely sums up Cicero's opinion of these poets after detailing the allusions.

To come to details: *Tr. (or Com.) Inc. Inc.* R. presumably refers to the fragments *ex incertis incertorum fabulis* in Ribbeck's collection; yet the bibliography promises a different abbreviation for Ribbeck's work. P. 23: *De Off.* II 21 can hardly be called a *locus classicus* for the Roman contempt of gainful occupations. P. 54: Cicero does not cite Laberius' prologue in *De Off.* I 114. P. 81: For 'Prometheus Bound' read 'Prometheus Unbound'; Aristophanes hardly praises Pericles in *Acharn.* 530 (wrongly printed 590). P. 84: *Io* is not a happy variant for *Ion* as the title of Euripides' play.

ARNOLD M. DUFF.

University College, Aberystwyth.

La Guerra Jugurthina. By E. CESAREO. Pp. xliii + 158. Florence: Le Monnier, 1931. Paper, L. 8.

'SALLUST is an artist rather than a historian.' This is the keynote of an edition in which the linguistic and grammatical commentary is brief, and a historical introduction is altogether lacking, but the stylistic qualities of Sallust are set forth at length and with unfeigned enthusiasm. In the Introduction Dr. Cesareo insists that, though Sallust might have borrowed his psychology from Thucydides, his interest in personalities and his archaic diction from Cornelius Sisenna, yet in essence he was a self-taught master. He also makes some acute observations on the lessons which the author of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* derived from the imperfections of his earlier work, the *Bellum Catilinae*: while Catiline is sprung upon us as a ready-made monster, Jugurtha is revealed to us gradually, and his vices are shown to be growing upon him (albeit not with that inevitableness of gradualness to which we capitulate in Tacitus' Tiberius). In the notes Dr. Cesareo holds up to our admiration many choice samples of Sallust's 'vibrant' style and trenchant argument; with evident enjoyment he shows up the high lights in Sallust's descriptions of natural scenery, and in those dramatic pieces of narrative which impress themselves on the mind's eye like scenes from Shakespeare or Dante. In a word, he reveals to us an artist who 'dominates his style.' At the same time he frankly acknowledges that Sallust's professed impartiality repeatedly failed him, and he speaks with becoming severity of the subterfuge of imputing base motives, which was begotten by Sallust and had a 'nequior proles' in Tacitus. Not the least pleasing feature in Dr. Cesareo's commentary is his sense of fair play and freedom from cheap cynicism. Altogether, though the present volume is of little use to the grammarian or historian, it is an original and refreshing contribution to the study of literary craftsmanship.

A few suggestions on the commentary may be offered here. Ch. I. § 3: Dr. Cesareo notes that in the *Jugurtha* man is left master of his own fate, but that in the *Catiline* he is made the sport of chance. He might have added that the latter view was probably derived from Caesar (*Bell. Civ.* III. 68). Ch. III. § 2 ('nam vi quidem regere patriam,' etc.): It is worth mentioning that this is the boldest criticism ever passed by a contemporary upon the Second Triumvirate. Ch. 48, § 3: It is now generally admitted that the breadth of the battlefield by the river Muthul cannot have been twenty miles. For XX. read X. or VII. Ch. 114, § 4 n.: The site of Marius' victory over the Teutones was not Aix-les-Bains (which is in Savoy) but Aix tout court (near Marseille).

University of London.

M. CARY.

Vellei Paterculi ad M. Vinicium Libri Duo. By A. BOLAFFI. Pp. xxvi + 180. Turin: Paravia and Co., 1930. Paper, L. 19.

THIS is a praiseworthy book. Mr. Bolaffi has carefully re-examined the Amerbach codex and

has been enabled in sundry places, where he says Ellis read it wrongly, to correct the reports of its readings. His introduction gives an interesting account of the history of the text with a full review of our one and only manuscript A, and mentions the work of the various scholars who have laboured in the elucidation and emendation of Velleius. There follow sections in which he explains the methods he employed in establishing his text and in which certain Velleian peculiarities in syntax and accidence are reviewed. The introduction is concluded with a concise bibliography. The text has the *apparatus criticus* printed under it on each page, and an *Index Nominum* brings the book to a close.

It is possible here to deal with only a few points taken practically at random. One is struck with the general conservatism of the text as compared with those of Ellis and Halm, and one might venture to say that it is more like Haase's than any other. An author with a tradition such as that of Velleius must always be a happy hunting-ground for rash emendators, and Mr. Bolaffi, who says '*lectionem traditam quam saepissime potui servavi*,' often provides a corrective to the unnecessary changes in which others have indulged—e.g. he seems right in keeping *maior vi* (II, 31, 1) *utile* (II, 46, 3) *illa . . . quando* (II, 52, 6), *ad tutelam* (II, 105, 3), and there is something to be said for *spectatus* which he retains in II, 104, 3.

The editor at times makes Velleius write Latin that is to say the least unusual, and surely sometimes definitely wrong, e.g. we have at II, 57, 3 *ineluctabilis fatorum vis, cuius cum fortunam mutare constituit, consilia conrumpit*, at II, 65, 2 *post urbem conditam abhinc annis †DCCVIII*, at II, 90, 1 *Alpes feris multisque nationibus celebres*, and at II, 20, 5 by retaining the order . . . *gratia, cuius augendae . . .* he leaves in Velleius an example of a construction our grammars tell us occurs only in Terence, Sallust and Tacitus.

Where he does adopt emendations, whether made by others or by himself, he is generally sane and cautious, though, to take one instance, we feel that the balance of probability is against the insertion <Ennii> in II, 9, 3. His own emendations rarely go so far as to add one word to the text, e.g. at II, 26, 3 he reads *Quantum huius gloriae famaе accessit! nunc virtute eminet, patria <fama> latet*, which is the best suggestion yet made to correct this passage.

The large clear type makes this a pleasant book to read, though the quality of the paper is not so good as that in other volumes of the Paravia series that we have known. Beyond an insignificant misprint in the introduction (p. xxv, last paragraph) the only correction to be made is in the *apparatus criticus* on p. 143, where for *cf.* 109, 1, read *cf.* 109, 5.

E. J. WOOD.

University of Manchester.

D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae. Editorum in usum edidit A. E. HOUSMAN. Pp. lviii+146. Cantabrigiae: Typis Academiae, 1931. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

IN 1905 Professor Housman published a charming edition of Juvenal, in stiff boards, coloured yellow to suggest the spirit of satire, just as his Manilius appears in blue, to suggest the night sky. The paper and type of the edition will be for long a joy to the bibliophile. It marked an epoch in two ways—first, because it contained the earliest real critical apparatus to Juvenal, the preparation of such an apparatus having been among the unfulfilled tasks of his predecessor; and second, because the book was inscribed 'editorum in usum edidit.' This part of the title was resented, but unjustly. Many editors were in need of the lash, and the punishment has proved salutary. The apostle of common sense in textual criticism delivered a message that was unpopular at the time, but is now recognised to have been absolutely necessary.

The edition went out of print in 1928, and the editor has been happily preserved to reissue it under the *aegis* of his adopted university, on a whiter paper of different character, and in a tasteful dark-red case, at more than double the price of the original edition. The text here furnished is for the most part a reprint of the earlier, and the whole book is in typography and arrangement very like its predecessor. The new matter consists mainly of an additional preface covering twenty-one pages, full of valuable remarks, the fruit of over twenty-five years' further study of the poet and of modern works dealing with him that have appeared in the interval.

For some reason, perhaps to save the time of an editor no longer young, the teaching of this preface has not been incorporated in the text itself, and possessors of the book would be well advised to make cross-references to the preface in the margins of the text, where such are necessitated by the notes therein contained. The questions of a double recension and interpolated lines in Juvenal are again discussed, in view especially of Leo's remarks in 1909, and the editor's '*esprit pénétrant*' appears in his views of the relation between P and its allies on the one hand and the 'vulgar' MSS. on the other. In the later parts many a shrewd blow is dealt at German scholars more distinguished for industry than insight, and many valuable parallels to Juvenal's diction are quoted.

One or two remarks suggest themselves. Why does Housman print IVNII on the title-page instead of IVNI? If he had been interested in *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, he might have mentioned, on p. vii, that P is 'genuine Lorsch work' (Minns in *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXVI. 218: *cf.* Lindsay, *Palaeographia Latina*, III. 12). On p. xlii we are told that Paris MS. 8072 (saec. x) 'gives a new and probably true reading at II. 45,' but we are left to discover from p. xliiv or from Stuart's article in *Class. Quart.* 1909, pp. 1-5, what that reading is. On p. xliii for 'S. A. Loew' read 'E. A. Loew.' On p. liv my experience concurs with Housman's that the miscopying of *quisquam* as *quis*

is rare. On p. lv it might have been pointed out that the *Thesaurus* makes a minor error in citing PELAG(ius) instead of PELAGON(ius).
A. SOUTER.

Scholias in Iuvenalem Vetustiora. Collegit recensuit illustravit P. WESSNER. Pp. xlviii + 339. Leipzig: Teubner, 1931. Cloth, RM. 19.40 (unbound, 18).

ALL that most students of Juvenal know of the scholia is contained in the excerpts provided in the Jahn-Bücheler-Leo edition. The curious have had to search for a fuller collection in the editions of Pithoeus (1585), Heinrich and Jahn. A new edition has long been required, both for the sake of Juvenal and for their own sake. For these scholia are no ordinary attempts at explanation from a mediaeval student but, in part at least, bear obvious marks of fourth-century origin. Professor Housman has repeatedly shown that they have value for the constitution of Juvenal's text also (e.g. *Sat.* 1, 156).

It is fortunate that the new editor has had wide experience in dealing with glossarial material, and we doubt if Dr. Wessner has ever done anything better than the present work, which is likely to hold the field for generations. The book has cost immense labour and is quite indispensable.

After the long preface on the character and sources of the scholia, the scholia are themselves printed, the main scholia in the upper part of the page, the Valla scholia below them in a smaller type, and the critical apparatus at the foot of the page. Then follows a most learned appendix illustrating the sources, meaning and language of the scholia. The work concludes with two copious indexes, one 'auctorum,' the other 'nominum, rerum, verborum.'

A few notes have occurred to me in reading this book. P. vi, the second edition of Ehrle and Liebaert might also have been referred to; p. vii, such spellings as *aegyptios* suggest a Welsh connexion; p. xiv, A. Holder, *Die Reichenauer Handschriften*, and P. Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliotheks-Kataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz* I. Bd. (1918), might also have been mentioned; p. xxvii, for 'They'n' read 'Gheyn'; p. 28, l. 7, p. 38, l. 10, why not 'Graccus,' which was the way the family spelt the name when they did not spell it 'Gracus'? P. 28, l. 21, why not 'Cartaginem'? P. 34, l. 3, p. 50, l. 5, why not 'Grecis'? (I think in fact that Wessner has made out the orthography of the MSS. to be inferior to what it actually is.) P. 74, l. 14, read *unanimis*, which is well attested in MSS. of other old authors. From various indications I strongly suspect that the Pithoean scholia have passed through an 'insular' stage, which would not be surprising in a Lorsch MS. (see Lindsay, *Palaeographia Latina* III. [1924]); Wessner has rightly restored *uices* at 9, 82, as I did in 1903 (*C.R.*, Vol. XVII.), defending it by two examples from another fourth-century author; it is surprising to see *u* and *v* separated in the index to a learned work. One or two trifling misprints have been noted.

The excellence of the paper and type deserve praise.
A. SOUTER.

Textkritiska Studier till Columellas Femte Bok. By RAGNAR POMOELL. Pp. viii + 111. Göteborg: Eranos Förlag, 1931.

THE fifth book of Columella has not yet appeared in the edition of Lundström, the chief authority on the author's text, but Lundström has lent his collations to Pomoell, who here discusses the text of a large number of passages. In many, perhaps in most cases the emendations which he has thus founded will find acceptance among scholars. On *sedule* (p. 1) he might have added a reference to Neue-Wagener (II 629): it is a very material objection to *perfervidus* as against *praefervidus* that it is not in the dictionaries (p. 8)! Among the words instanced on p. 13 *cogilo* might have found a place: p. 62, n. 1, add a reference to *CSEL*, vol. I, index: p. 71, I do not see why *trifurcamina* should not be right, if we compare *sulcamen*. The bibliography (cf. also pp. 107 ff.) contains thirty items, of which not one is British and only one American. Perhaps if a society were founded to place British and American works on Latin in the libraries of Dutch, Swedish and other Universities of North-Western Europe, young students in these would condescend to open them. There are misprints on pages 6 and 108 of this indispensable work.
A. SOUTER.

Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De Baptismo. Edidit J. G. P. BORLEFFS. Pp. 102. Leyden: Brill, 1931.

THE *De Baptismo* of Tertullian was first printed in the Paris edition of 1545 from a manuscript now lost, and it was believed until quite recent times that no manuscript of this work survived. Dom André Wilmart, however, in 1916 discovered a twelfth-century MS. at Troyes (No. 523). This discovery made a new edition imperative. Dr. Borleffs, having obtained a photograph of the MS., prepared the edition which is now before us. It marks an immense advance on all previous editions, and is equipped with an introduction, a full and learned apparatus, and a complete *index verborum*. No student of this important treatise can afford to dispense with Dr. Borleffs' edition.

It happens that I collated the Troyes MS. itself in 1920. Dr. Borleffs' reports and mine agree in most cases. We disagree sometimes where erasures have taken place, and here probably a collator of the MS. itself has the advantage over the collator of a photograph. Page 18, line 14, I read what is above the line as *li*, not *ti*, changing *aguum* to *aliquam*. P. 22, l. 1, *Pelusiis* was accepted as the true reading and translated by the present writer eight years before the scholar who *primus defendit* according to the apparatus. Why is *emundat* read at p. 22, 12, and *emundatur* rejected at p. 21, 13, since Isidore is given to altering the language of his sources in just this

sort of way? At p. 23, 5, I should say 'b ex p,' not 'b ex u.' P. 26, 8, *capitibus* (om. T) is absent from the text, though it is in the index. P. 32, 6, I have recorded *precursorem* as the reading of T also. P. 34, 6, the cross stroke crosses the stem of the 'h' in 'ioh.' P. 43, 13, it might have been explained that 'amartiis' is the *ἀμαρτίας* of the Greek; that *amartia* had some vogue in Latin is suggested by the *Amartigenia* (so the MSS.) of Prudentius. There are misprints on pp. 9 and 42.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Neue Wege zur Antike VIII. Pp. 117. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1929. Paper, RM. 5. THE eighth issue of *Neue Wege zur Antike*—a notice of which should have appeared in this journal more than a year and a half ago—consists of three excellent lectures given at Breslau with reports of the discussions that followed. Dr. Walther Kranz gives suggestions for the best courses of Platonic reading in the gymnasium with a survey of some recently discussed problems that can be treated with advantage to the pupils. With remarkable lucidity Professor Alfred Körte surveys the field of research in the study of Greek choric metres. In the discussion that followed the pious hope was expressed that from the earliest stages of teaching more attention in future will be given to the sound of verse. Professor Wolfgang Schadewaldt of Königsberg (in the longest of the three lectures as here reported) makes some sane criticism of Tycho von Wilamowitz, and suggests

how the *ἦθος* of the main characters in Sophocles is unfolded. Schadewaldt takes for his purpose the 'deception' speech of Ajax and the end of Antigone's last long speech (ll. 913 ff.). Ajax reveals a true change of mood, and though there is an element of 'deception'—necessary for technical reasons so that the chorus and Tecmessa may not know his true purpose—the Greek audience would not be concerned much with the psychology of the deception since during the acting of the scene it would be under the spell of the new self-restraint of Ajax, and would be realizing that he had indeed learnt to 'yield to the Gods.' Antigone, when faced with necessity for action, had not allowed herself to doubt, but when death is certain she can in her shaken faith even envisage the possibility of the 'other side' being right. Both the *ἠμοκρατής* Ajax and Antigone with her *ἠμὸν γέννημα* remain true to their strong natures, yet both undergo in some sense a change of attitude which has the effect of revealing them more to the audience. Though not professing great originality this study is interesting and to a large extent sound. In the opinion of the present reviewer too much is made of the parallel between the two characters and their *ἀντιποία*, while not sufficient stress is laid on the difference between the change of mood experienced by each. The best thing in the lecture is the suggestion of the senses in which characterization in Sophocles is and is not 'psychological.'

S. K. JOHNSON.

University College of Swansea.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

Δωπλοδὲν δ' ἔξεσσι, δοκῶ, τοῖς Δωπλοδοῖσι.

The last time that I was accused in your columns of lapsing into transatlantic idiom was when I neglected to protect by marks of quotation a phrase of Keats' *Ode to a Nightingale*, which I could trust my American readers to recognize.¹ This time my offense seems to be that I tried to capture the benevolence of an undergraduate audience by beginning my talk with a mild undergraduate jest which I said that I had overheard on the campus. Seriously, a reviewer has a right to his preferences, his prejudices even, but is it quite cricket according to the best British practice in a review of a book that contains six lectures to give half your space to 'slating' one of them and to omit all mention of the main content and interest of that one? Instead of a balanced estimate leaning, if you please, to severity, your reviewer has nothing to offer but the inevitable gibe at Americanisms, an angry retort to a polemical digression which did well enough in the lecture but might perhaps have been judiciously omitted in the printing, and a sneer at three obvious and unimportant inaccuracies. One of these is entirely insignificant and if admitted would

commit the reviewer to the admission that I quote and translate Sophocles from memory; a second depends on the reviewer's captious interpretation of my meaning; and the third is at the worst a careless inference from a single line about a minor link in the action off the stage. None of them concerns Greek scholarship or the thought or style of Sophocles. Any reviewer might be thanked for correcting such slips of the pen. No fair-minded reviewer would harp on them to make an invidious point. Your reviewer seems to wish to convey the impression that he is dealing with a crude ignorant enthusiast who may love Sophocles, but knows very little about him. Does he believe that? Does he really think that the style of the lecture is that of the *προλαλία* to the students? Does he sincerely believe that, because I somewhat ambiguously abbreviated a transition in order to bring in quotations from Schiller and Matthew Arnold, I thought that Philoctetes is a character in the *Trachiniae* and that Sophocles actually changed the scene to the summit of Mount Oeta?

Yours truly,
PAUL SHOREY.

¹ [C.R. XIV (1900), pp. 230, 289.]

SIRS,

You have thought fit to entrust the reviewing of my Propertius to one who has himself published an edition of that poet, and with whose interpretations I have so often had to express disagreement. I am not imputing any unworthy motive to Professor Butler when I ask whether, in such circumstances, it would be possible for anyone to view my work with an open mind.

I cannot, of course, defend the passage in my Preface which he very properly condemns, though I could explain, if it were worth while, how it came to remain uncorrected. But I wish to point out that the dates of the MSS. have no bearing whatever on the prime object of my work, namely the restoration of unbroken continuity to the text. Of this Professor Butler takes hardly any notice. He merely complains of the number of my transpositions—as well might he blame the restorer of the Portland Vase for making so many adjustments—and mentions as the worst example (he gives no other) the placing of 3. 22. 37-8, where he him-

self declares these to be 'impossible,' to follow 3. 16. 6, where they are quite appropriate. I have made a practice of giving reasons for my transpositions: not one of these does he attempt to confute. The new interpretations of many obscure passages are passed by without a word of comment, as also are the original views I hold as to Propertius' extreme youth, his ill-health, the real cause of his twelve months' banishment, the reason of his indignation against Cynthia in 2. 20, his attitude towards Octavian, etc. Had my edition appeared before his, Professor Butler would have been spared many of his perplexities.

He cites examples of what he *ex cathedra* asserts to be my 'failings.' I admit two only. For others I have the authority of Postgate.

I can only conclude that Professor Butler was unable to spare time for any but a cursory survey of my work. As to his opinion of the translation, *de gustibus*. . .

Yours faithfully,

SEYMOUR G. TREMENHEERE.

April 1, 1932.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(DECEMBER, 1931-MARCH, 1932.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—J. Martin, *Symposium. Die Geschichte einer literarischen Form* [Paderborn, 1931, Schöningh. Pp. 320] (Geffcken). The first general survey of this type of literary composition; fills a long-felt gap with desirable thoroughness.—K. Holzinger, *Erklärungen umstrittener Stellen des Aristophanes*. S.B. d. Wien. Ak. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl. Bd. 208, 5 [Vienna, 1928, Holder-Pichler-Tempsky. Pp. 76] (Wüst). Noteworthy contribution to the explanation of six disputed passages, four of them from the Wasps.—M. Pohlenz, *Die griechische Tragödie. Also Eriäuterungen* [Leipzig, 1930, Teubner. Pp. vi+542. Pp. 148] (Körte). Reviewer considers this the best general survey of Greek Tragedy that we possess. All concerned with the Attic tragedians will have to read it carefully.—E. Cahen, *Callimaque et son œuvre poétique. Also Les hymnes de Callimaque, commentaire explicatif et critique*. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 134, 134 bis [1929, Pp. 655. 1930, Pp. 283] (Kalinka). Does not contain much new; but so useful as a conscientious and critical collection of results of previous research that no one interested in Callimachus should overlook it.—Barbara C. J. Timmer, *Megasthenes en de indische Maatschappij* [Amsterdam, 1930, Pp. 323] (Kraemer). Attractive and instructive. Conscientious collection of all the relevant material and a real advance in the problems connected with Megasthenes. Deserves many readers.—A. Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen über Plutarchs biographische Technik* [Berlin, 1931, Weidmann. Pp. iv+122]

(Schönemann). Carefully thought out and very valuable. But reviewer disagrees on several points.

LATIN LITERATURE.—K. Witte, *Die Geschichte der römischen Dichtung im Zeitalter des Augustus. Zweiter Teil: Horaz. Erster Band: Horazens Sermomendichtung* [Erlangen, 1931, Selbstverlag des Verfassers. Pp. 288] (Seel). W.'s book indicates new and exceedingly fruitful possibilities in literary criticism. He makes an understanding of Horace's poetry depend on the recognition of three things, (1) transitional links, (2) references, (3) quantitative balance of sections.—N. Terzaghi, *Orazio* [Rome, 1930, Formaggini. Pp. 89] (Hosius). A sketch in profile, full of light and warmth. Does not pretend to be a full biography. Reviewer raises a few doubtful points.—B. Edmar, *Studien zu den Epistulae ad Caesarem senem de re publica* [Lund, 1931, Ohlsson. Pp. 177] (Klotz). Most detailed linguistic commentary on the Epistulae ad Caesarem supports Sallustian authorship. Reviewer hopes the controversy will now cease.

HISTORY.—E. Derenne, *Les procès d'impieété intentés aux philosophes à Athènes au V^{me} et au IV^{me} siècles avant J.-C.* [Liège, 1930, Vaillant-Carmanne. Pp. 271] (Nestle). Reveals throughout a thorough study of the sources and excellent knowledge of modern literature on the subject.—U. Wilcken, *Alexander der Grosse* [Leipzig, 1931, Quelle u. Meyer. Pp. ix+316] (Lenschau). Ripe fruit of a life devoted to study of Alexander. Will long remain the foundation of research in this field.

RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY.—F. Altheim, *Terra Mater. Untersuchungen zur altital-*

- ischen Religionsgeschichte* [Giessen, 1931, Töpelmann. Pp. 160] (Marbach). This very learned book shows complete command of the historical tradition and archaeological and linguistic material. Generally convincing, though reviewer finds a number of points about which he disagrees.—A. H. Krappe, *Mythologie universelle* [Paris, 1930, Payot. Pp. 455] (Pfister). Stimulating and readable handbook for workers in the field of comparative religion. The treatment of the mythologies is uneven, which is partly due to the vastness of the subject. Useful bibliography.
- EPIGRAPHY.**—F. Chapouthier, *Les écritures minoennes au palais de Mallia* [Paris, 1930, Geuthner. Pp. xii+95] (Fuchs). Excellent reproductions and discussion of various seals and inscriptions; also a chapter on the Minoan forms of writing and the origin of the alphabet. Derivation from Egyptian hieroglyphs is better supported than hitherto.—B. D. Meritt, *Greek Inscriptions 1896-1927 = Corinth, Vol. VIII, Part I*. Published for the American School of Classical Studies at Athens [Cambridge, Mass., 1931, Harvard Univ. Press. Pp. 180.] (Hiller von Gaertringen). Contains 331 items, largely fragmentary, reproduced either in drawings or in photographs, with commentary and index. Reviewer expresses gratitude for the patient and careful work.
- LEXICOGRAPHY.**—F. A. Heinichen, *Lateinisch-deutsches Schulwörterbuch. Ausgabe mit Berücksichtigung ausgewählter mittellateinischer Schriftsteller. 10. Aufl. des ursprünglichen Werkes* [Leipzig, 1931, Teubner. Pp. lvi+648] (Eichenberg). Much more than its modest title 'School Dictionary' would suggest. Invaluable not only for Classical scholars, but also for those interested in Middle Latin, the most essential vocabulary of which (circ. 13,000 slips) is included.—*Heidelberger Konträrindex der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*. Leitung: O. Gradenwitz. Bearbeiter: F. Hilabel, E. Pfeiffer, A. Lauer [Berlin, 1931, Weidmann. Pp. vii+127] (K. F. W. Schmidt). Part A contains all the words in Preisigke's dictionary arranged on the pattern of the *Laterculi Vocum Latinorum*. An excellent aid to study of papyrus texts. Part C adds words (not exhaustive) omitted by Preisigke. Indispensable.
- ARCHAEOLOGY.**—*Corinth, results of excavations conducted by the American School at Athens. Vol. III, Part I: Acrocorinth* [Cambridge, Mass., 1930, Harvard Univ. Press. Pp. ix+75, and 8 plates] (P. Herrmann). Section on coins from Peirene by A. R. Bellinger of special interest to historians as well as to numismatists.—Catherine Dunareanu-Vulpe, *Considérations sur certaines formes caractérisant l'âge du bronze de l'Europe sud-orientale* [Paris, 1930, Gamber. Pp. 60, and 3 plates] (Schachermeyr). A study of types. Utilises finds at Ur and unpublished material in Balkan Museums. Competent and discriminating.—R. Vulpe, *L'âge du fer dans les régions Thraces de la péninsule Balcanique* [Paris, 1930, Gamber. Pp. x+183, with 6 plates and a map] (Schachermeyr). Valuable as a collection of inaccessible material and for the light it throws on the history of Classical times.—*The Excavations at Doura-Europos. (1) Preliminary Report of first season of work, Spring 1928. (2) Preliminary Report of second season of work, October 1928*. Ed. by P. V. C. Baur and M. I. Rostovtzeff [New Haven, 1929 and 1931, Yale Univ. Press. Pp. x+77 and Pp. xix+225, with 53 plates] (Thomsen). Excellent and, for a preliminary one, a most exhaustive report of excavation on an exceptionally interesting site on the Euphrates.—L. Séchan, *Études sur la tragédie grecque dans ses rapports avec la céramique* [Paris, Champion. Pp. viii+642, and 9 plates] (Rumpf). Shows immense industry, but want of discrimination and ignorance of important recent work.—D. M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus. Part IV: The Terra-cottas of Olynthus found in 1928* [Baltimore, 1931, Johns Hopkins Press. Pp. 165, and 63 plates] (Lippold). Important for dating of Greek terra-cottas. Thoroughness to some extent sacrificed to speedy publication of material.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * * *Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Ailloud (H.).** Suétone. Vies des douze Césars. Tome II: Tibère-Néron. Tome III: Galba-Domitien. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 30 and 20 frs.
- Altheim (F.).** Römische Religionsgeschichte II. Von der Gründung des kapitolinischen Tempels bis zum Aufkommen der Alleinherrschaft. Pp. 154. (Sammlung Götschen, 1052.) Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1932. Cloth, R.M. 1.62.
- Baker (G. P.).** Justinian. Pp. xvii+340; illustrations. London: Nash and Grayson, 1932. Cloth, 18s.
- Bell (H. I.), Nock (A. D.), Thompson (H.).** Magical Texts from a Bilingual Papyrus in the British Museum. Edited with translations, commentary, and facsimiles. Pp. 55. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XVII.) London: Milford, 1932. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.
- Brix-Niemeyer.** Ausgewählte Komödien des T. Maccius Plautus, erklärt. Erstes Bänd-

- chen: Trinummus. Sechste Auflage neu bearbeitet von F. Conrad. Pp. 168. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1931. Boards, RM. 5.60 (stitched, 4.80).
- Burn** (A. R.) The Romans in Britain. An Anthology of Inscriptions. With translations and a running commentary. Pp. 228; 4 plates. Oxford: Blackwell, 1932. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Carcopino** (J.) Ce que Rome et l'Empire Romain doivent à la Gaule. Pp. 36. (The Zaharoff Lecture.) Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1932. Paper, 2s. net.
- Casey** (R. P.) Serapion of Thmuis against the Manichees. Pp. 80. (Harvard Theological Studies, XV. Issued as an extra number of the Harvard Theological Review.) Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1931. Paper, 8s. 6d.
- Collingwood** (R. G.) Roman Britain. Pp. xii+160; map and 59 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Cooper** (L.) The Rhetoric of Aristotle. An expanded translation with supplementary examples for students of composition and public speaking. Pp. xlix+259. New York and London: D. Appleton, 1932. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Cornelius** (F.) Cannae. Das militärische und das literarische Problem. Pp. iv+86. (Klio, Neue Folge, XIII. Beiheft.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, M.5 (bound, 6.50).
- Dawkins** (R. M.) Leontios Makhairas. Recital concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus entitled 'Chronicle.' Edited with a translation and notes. 2 vols. Pp. xvi+685+333; map and genealogical table. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Deferrari** (R. J.) and **Campbell** (J. M.) A Concordance to Prudentius. Pp. ix+833. Cambridge (U.S.A.): The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1932. Paper, \$12.50 post-free.
- de Koning** (P. W.) Virgilius' Herderszangen. Naast den oorspronkelijken Latijnschen text metrisch vertaald. Pp. 115. Amsterdam: Swets en Zeitlinger, 1932. Paper.
- de Labriolle** (P.) Les Satires de Juvénal. Etude et analyse. Pp. 367. Paris: Mellottée. Paper.
- Diller** (H.) Die Ueberlieferung der hippokratischen Schrift *Περὶ αἰώνων ὕδατων τόπων*. Pp. vi+190. (Philologus, Supplementband XXII, Heft III.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, M.12 (bound, 14).
- Duthie** (A.) Readings from Caesar. Second Series. The Gallic War, Books IV and V. Pp. 108. London etc.: Harrap, 1932. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Ellis** (O. C. de C.) A History of Fire and Flame. Pp. xxiv+436; illustrations. London: The Poetry Lovers' Fellowship, 1932. Cloth, 15s.
- Ferguson** (W. S.) The Treasurers of Athena. Pp. xiii+198. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$4 or 21s. 6d. net.
- Festa** (N.) I Frammenti degli Stoici antichi, ordinati tradotti e annotati. Vol. I. Zenone. Pp. viii+129. Bari: Gius. Laterza, 1932. Paper, L.15.
- Forsdyke** (E. J.) Minoan Art. Pp. 30; 8 illustrations in text, 13 plates. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XV.) London: Milford. Paper, 6s. 6d.
- Frank** (T.) Some Aspects of Social Behavior in Ancient Rome. Pp. xi+155. (Martin Classical Lectures, Vol. II.) Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, \$2 or 10s. 6d. net.
- Glots** (G.) Histoire grecque. Tome II: La Grèce au V^e Siècle. Fascicules I, II, III. Pp. 1-480. (Histoire générale: Histoire ancienne, 2^{me} partie.) Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France. Paper, 12.50 fr. each.
- Hardy** (E. R.) The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt. Pp. 162. New York: Columbia University Press (London: P. S. King), 1931. Cloth, \$3 or 15s.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.** Vol. XLII. Pp. 190. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1931. Cloth, 11s. 6d. net.
- Harvard** (J.) The Platonic Epistles. Translated with Introduction and Notes. Pp. xii+244. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Hege** (W.) and **Rodenwaldt** (G.) The Acropolis, photographed by W. H. and described by G. R. Pp. 61; 35 illustrations, 104 plates. Oxford: Blackwell. Cloth, 37s. 6d.
- Herrmann** (E.) Lautgesetz und Analogie. Pp. vii+204. (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., N.F., Bd. XXIII, 3.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1931. Paper, RM. 14.
- Hesperia.** Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. I. Pp. 218; plates. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Paper, \$3.
- Hommel** (H.) *Metoikoi*. Terminologie, Geschichte und System des athenischen Beisassenrechts. (Sonderabdruck aus Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Band XV.)
- Huchzermeyer** (H.) Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Ausgang der klassischen Zeit. Pp. 76. Emsdetten (Westf.): H. und J. Lechte, 1931. Paper.
- Junghanns** (P.) Die Erzählungstechnik von Apuleius' Metamorphosen und ihrer Vorlage. Pp. 184. (Philologus, Supplementband XXIV, Heft 1.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1932. Paper, M.11.50 (bound, 13.50).
- Lavedan** (P.) Dictionnaire illustré de la Mythologie et des Antiquités grecques et romaines. Pp. ii+1037; 1015 illustrations. Paris: Hachette. Paper.
- Lawson** (J. C.) Aeschylus. The Agamemnon. A revised text with introduction, verse translation and critical notes. Pp. xlvii+168. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Lewis** (C. B.) Classical Mythology and Ar-

- thurian Romance. Pp. xvii+332. London: Milford, 1932. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Liddell and Scott.* A Greek-English Lexicon. A new edition, Part 6. A-ol. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1932. Paper, 10s. 6d. net.
- Ljungvik (H.)* Beiträge zur Syntax der spätgriechischen Volkssprache. Pp. viii+110. (Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala. 27:3.) Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1932. Paper, 4 kr.
- Lyde (L. W.)* A Patchwork from Pindar, with an English translation in verse. Pp. iv+76. Oxford: Blackwell, 1932. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Machail (J. W.)* The Odyssey translated in verse. Pp. x+513. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Macurdy (G. H.)* Hellenistic Queens. A study of woman-power in Macedonia, Seleucid Syria, and Ptolemaic Egypt. Pp. xv+250; 12 figures. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 14.) Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 24s. net.
- Momigliano (A.)* L'Opera dell' Imperatore Claudio. Pp. 143. (Collana Storica, XL1.) Florence: Vallecchi, 1932. Paper, L.10.
- Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua.* Vol. iii. Denkmäler aus dem Rauhen Kilikien, von J. Keil und A. Wilhelm. Pp. xiv+238; numerous drawings in text, 58 plates. (Publications of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor. Vol. III.) Manchester: University Press, 1931. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Morland (H.)* Die lateinischen Oribasius-übersetzungen. Pp. 202. (Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. Supplet. V.) Oslo: Brøgger, 1932. Paper.
- Mustard (W. P.)* The Eclogues of Henrique Cayado. Edited, with introduction and notes. Pp. 98. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1931. Cloth, 9s. 6d.
- Nilsson (M. P.)* The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology. Pp. 258. (Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. 8.) Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 17s. 6d. net.
- Norström (V.)* Poseidon och hans *εκηπάριον*: ett bidrag till kännedom om mytens och sagans uppkomst. Pp. 40. Om Hermes *χουρὸπαρις*. Pp. 30. Helsingfors: Mercators Tryckeri, 1931 and 1932. Paper, FM. 20 each.
- Persson (A. W.)* The Royal Tombs at Dendra near Midea. Pp. viii+152; 4 coloured plates, 32 plates, 86 figures in text. (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-samfundet i Lund. XV.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1931. Cloth.
- Previtt-Orton (C. W.)* Opera hactenus inedita T. Livii de Frulovisiis de Ferraria. Pp. xxxvii+397; 5 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Ritter (C.)* Sokrates. Pp. 87. Platonische Liebe: dargestellt durch Uebersetzung und Erläuterung des Symposions. Pp. 92. Tübingen: H. Laupp, 1931. Paper, M.2.60 each.
- Säflund (G.)* La Mura di Roma repubblicana. Pp. xvi+278; 28 plates, 72 figures. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom. 1.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1932. Paper.
- Smith (H. R. W.)* The Origin of Chalcidian Ware. (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 85-145, plates 9-24, 10 figures in text.) Berkeley (U.S.A.): University of California Press, 1932. Paper, \$1.50.
- Steele (R.)* Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi. Fasc. XI. Pp. xxx+334. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1932. Paper, 25s. net.
- Stein (A.)* Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur. Pp. 86. Prag: Taussig, 1931. Paper, RM. 3.
- Stürenburg (H.)* Relative Ortsbezeichnung. Zum geographischen Sprachgebrauch der Griechen und Römer. Pp. ii+44. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1932. Paper, RM. 2.80.
- Symbolae Osloenses*, Fasc. X. Ediderunt S. Eitrem et C. Rudberg. Pp. 179. Oslo: Brøgger, 1932. Paper.
- Thomas Ashby, 1874-1931. Pp. 29. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XVII.) London: Milford, 1932. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Throm (H.)* Die Thesis. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Entstehung und Geschichte. Pp. 198. (Rhetorische Studien, 17. Heft.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1932. Paper, M. 11.
- Tod (M. N.)* Sidelights on Greek History. Three Lectures on the Life and Thought of the Ancient World. Pp. 96. Oxford: Blackwell, 1932. Boards, 2s. 6d. net.
- Todd (O. J.)* Index Aristophaneus. Pp. ix+275. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 28s. net.
- van Manen (J. J.)* Πενία εν Πλοῦτος in de Periode na Alexander. Pp. 139. Zutphen: N. V. Nauta, 1931. Paper.
- Vieillefond (J. R.)* Jules Africain: Fragments des Cestes provenant de la collection des tacticiens grecs. Edités avec une introduction et des notes critiques. Pp. lviii+96. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1932. Paper, 60 fr.
- Walde (A.)* Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Dritte neu bearbeitete Auflage von J. B. Hofmann. Lieferung 5. Pp. 321-400. Heidelberg: Winter, 1932. Paper, M.1.50.
- Westermann (W. L.) and Keyes (C. W.)* Tax Lists and Transportation Receipts from Theadelphia. Edited with Introduction and Notes. Pp. xi+219. (Columbia Papyri, Greek Series, II.) New York: Columbia University Press. (London: Milford), 1932. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Wright (F. A.)* A History of Later Greek Literature from the Death of Alexander in 323 B.C. to the Death of Justinian in 565 A.D. Pp. xi+415. London: Routledge, 1932. Cloth, 18s. net.

a.
f-
(.)
2.

an
a-
3;
t.)
ia

eri
d;
12.

en
11.

ag.
er
nd

S.
o:

om
ny,
er,

rer
ne-
n:

ry.
ek
the
ck-

75.
ity
8s.

de
en:

nts
des
luc-
96.
per,

7ör-
von
400.
50.

Tax
rom
and
pyri,
mbia
932.

reek
r in
A.D.
932.